

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

April — June 1959

LONDON
S · P · C · K

1959

*Published by S.P.C.K.
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1*

*Printed in Great Britain by
The Talbot Press (S.P.C.K.), Saffron Walden, Essex*

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Rev. Leonard Hodgson, D.D.
The Rev. Canon E. S. Abbott,
Warden of Keble College, Oxford.

The Rt Rev. R. C. Mortimer,
Bishop of Exeter.
The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.

EDITOR

The Rt Rev. and Rt Hon. J. W. C. Wand, K.C.V.O., D.D.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

LAMBETH AND UNITY

E. L. Mascall

FAITH IN THE TRINITY

R. V. Sellers

EDMUND GRINDAL AND THE NORTHERN PROVINCE

R. L. Arundale

THE BEHMENISTS

W. H. G. Armytage

THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CONSCIENCE IN
POST-WAR GERMANY

P. J. Chandler

NUMEN, NIRVANA, AND THE DEFINITION OF RELIGION

Ninian Smart

EXISTENTIALISM AND ASCETICAL THEOLOGY

H. P. Owen

MATINS AND ANTE-COMMUNION

J. A. Thurmer

THE MYSTICISM OF CHARTRES

Rhys S. Jones

A FURTHER NOTE ON THE EPISCOPAL LICENSING
OF SCHOOLMASTERS

J. Addy

CORRESPONDENCE

REVIEWS

A detailed list of books and reviewers appears on the following pages.

REVIEWS

- JAMES D. WOOD: *The Interpretation of the Bible*; T. E. JESSOP: *On Reading the English Bible*; EDWARD J. YOUNG: *The Study of Old Testament Theology To-day*; RAYMOND ABBA: *The Nature and Authority of the Bible*. By J. Robinson
- F. L. CROSS (ed.): *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. By J. S. Bezzant
- F. E. BRIGHTMAN: *What Objections have been made to English Orders?* ANON: *The Elizabethan Bishops and the Civil Power*; W. E. COLLINS: *Queen Elizabeth's Defence of her Proceedings in Church and State*; B. J. KIDD: *The Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*. By Thomas M. Parker
- DANIEL JENKINS: *The Protestant Ministry*. By the Bishop of Exeter
- WALTER ROLAND FOSTER: *Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688*. By the Bishop of Brechin
- MILLAR MACLURE: *The Paul's Cross Sermons*. By the Editor
- D. W. GUNDRY: *Religions: A Preliminary Historical and Theological Study*. By E. O. James
- WILLIAM D. GEOGHEGAN: *Platonism in Recent Religious Thought*. By Adam Fox
- H. C. PORTER: *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge*. By Thomas M. Parker
- RAYMOND RAYNES, C.R.: *Darkness no Darkness*. By T. L. Manson, S.S.J.E.
- T. W. MANSON: *Ministry and Priesthood, Christ's and Ours*. By S. M. Gibbard, S.S.J.E.
- JOACHIM JEREMIAS: *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*. By J. S. Bezzant
- PETER F. ANSON: *Abbot Extraordinary*. By Frederic Hood
- CONSTANCE PADWICK: *Call to Istanbul*. By K. H. Henrey
- EMILE DERMENGHEM: *Muhammad and the Islamic Tradition*. By K. H. Henrey
- WILLIAM ERNEST HOCKING: *The Coming World Civilization*. By Stephan Hopkinson
- WILLIAM WYLIE: *The Pattern of Love*. By Stephan Hopkinson
- FRANCIS L. WHEELER: *The Unfolding Year*. By H. Riley

- R. A. WARD: *Royal Sacrament: The Preacher and his Message.* By George Reindorp
- JOHN T. WILKINSON (ed.): *Arthur Samuel Peake (1865-1929): Essays in Commemoration.* By Harold Roberts
- The Greek New Testament.* By A. J. B. Higgins
- ERIC G. JAY: *New Testament Greek: An Introductory Grammar.* By A. J. B. Higgins
- DOROTHY BETHURUN: *The Homilies of Wulfstan.* By A. J. Macdonald
- J. G. DAVIES: *He Ascended into Heaven.* By C. S. Mann, O.S.B.
- HARRY BLAMIRE: *The Kirkbride Conversations.* By the Bishop of Willesden
- J. D. BENOIT: *Liturgical Renewal.* By John R. Satterthwaite
- M. CHINIGO (ed.): *The Teachings of Pope Pius XII*; OSCAR HARDMAN: "But I am a Catholic!"; G. F. S. GRAY: *The Anglican Communion.* By Kenneth N. Ross
- J. ERNEST RATTENBURY: *Thoughts on Holy Communion.* By George M. Bosworth
- ALAN A. JACKA (ed.): *Ten Years: Echoes from the First Decade of "Child Care", 1947-56*; HERBERT W. ABBA: *To Build and to Plant.* By Frank A. F. Poulden
- GEORGE YULE: *The Independents and the English Civil War.* By John Huxtable
- JOHN NORTON: *The Answer.* By Gordon Huelin
- Spencer Leeson: Shepherd, Teacher, Friend.* By the Bishop of Peterborough

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

The Reverend E. L. MASCALL, D.D., is Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford, and Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion.

The Reverend R. V. SELLERS, D.D., is Canon and Chancellor of Wells Cathedral, and was Professor of Biblical and Historical Theology at King's College, London, from 1948 to 1954.

Mr R. L. ARUNDALE is Headmaster of the County Secondary School, Horbury, near Wakefield, Yorkshire.

Professor W. H. G. ARMYTAGE is Professor of Education in the University of Sheffield.

The Reverend P. J. CHANDLER, Vicar of North Baddesley, Southampton, is a member of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches Committee of the C. of E. Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr R. N. SMART is Lecturer in the History and Philosophy of Religion at King's College, London.

The Reverend H. P. OWEN is Lecturer at the University College of Bangor, North Wales.

The Reverend J. A. THURMER is Chaplain of the Theological College, Salisbury.

Mr RHYS S. JONES, PH.D., F.R.S.A., is Senior French Master at King's College School, Cardiff, and is a former Fellow of the University of Wales.

Mr J. ADDY is Senior Master in Charge of Religious Education and History at Darton Boys' Secondary School, Kexborough, Barnsley, Yorkshire.

CANON CLAUDE JENKINS

CLAUDE JENKINS, D.D., F.S.A., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, died on 17 January 1959. A man of monumental learning, endearing eccentricity, and deep Christian faith, he had held, among other posts before he went back to Oxford, the Chair of Ecclesiastical History at King's College, London, the Librarianship at Lambeth Palace, and a Residentiary Canonry of Canterbury. He was a leading member of the group that revived the Church Historical Society in 1929, and was Chairman of its Publications Committee from then until his death. From 1903 to 1927 he shared in the editorship of the *Church Quarterly Review*, and he long continued to take an interest in the journal.

EDITORIAL

A NEW portent has appeared in the firmament of Biblical Studies with the publication of Alan Richardson's *New Testament Theology*.¹ It is not simply that the book has arrived at the moment when we were saying that there is no such thing as a New Testament theology: that there is a Pauline, a Johannine, perhaps even a Petrine theology, but since each author speaks with his own voice there cannot be any one theology common to the whole New Testament. Professor Richardson does not adopt the method of some other writers on the subject by speaking of one theology in his title and then giving us a dozen different ones between the covers. He lets us see the differences, but he contrives to subsume them all under one common whole.

The really important feature of the book is the means by which he contrives this unity. If we ask how he is able to perform this miracle, the answer is that he tries to get behind the individual writers to the Apostolic Tradition upon which they all drew. The rehabilitation of tradition has been one of the more striking features of theological advance in our day. It is not of course tradition in the old sense, running through a number of centuries into the medieval period and ending no one knows where. It is the tradition of the first century built up by the contemporaries and disciples of Christ. The New Testament writers stored up what they could of it for us, each giving it an individual flavour of his own. But there must have been a good deal that never became stereotyped or at least was never committed to writing. It is to this amorphous exposition of the faith, the *didache* behind the *kerygma*, that we try to reach back.

Here arises another point of great interest. The main reason for this reliance upon the tradition rather than upon any individual writer or his alleged facts is that we are suffering from an extreme reaction against the notion of history as an exact science that consists in revealing to us precisely what happened. We know that authors are highly selective and that they each and all write from their own point of view. Their stories are therefore coloured; and we are in despair of ever knowing individual events apart from interpretation. To base your history as broadly as possible rather than on a series of single facts seems therefore good policy.

¹ Alan Richardson, *Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*. (S.C.M. Press, 30s.)

One is reminded of the thirteenth-century builders of Salisbury Cathedral. As they were erecting their vast structure in the middle of a marsh, they could not trust each pillar to carry its independent thrust to the foundations. They therefore built a low stone platform all the way round the interior of the church and rested their pillars on that. The thrust was thereby evenly distributed over a comparatively wide area.

The secular historians have begun toying with the same idea. It so happened that when Alan Richardson's excellent book came into our hands we had just finished reading Philip Bagby's *Culture and History*.² He makes no bones about it at all. He wants historical researchers to "give up their futile attempts to establish the exact truth as to individual actions in the past". What he would like them to do is to devote their time and skill to the investigation of whole cultures. By examining the variations, rise, and fall of civilization they will be able for the first time to establish their history on a truly scientific basis. It is extremely interesting that Bagby's "culture" should so neatly coincide as a historical expedient with Richardson's "tradition".

All this seems satisfactory enough so long as it does not lead us to despair too deeply or too soon of orthodox history. After all, the highly skilled and painful researches of so many decades cannot just have gone for nothing. We were amused a few evenings ago to see (and hear) a well-known professor explain on the television screen what a large proportion of "history" can still be taken as indubitable fact. It is possible, he instanced, to have widely diverse opinions about the respective merits and measures of Charles I and Cromwell, but there can be no doubt at all about the fact that Charles came first. And that is a historical datum of the first importance.

Bagby wants the historian to neglect the trees for the time being and to look only at the wood. One hopes that this advice will not be tendered to the theologians, for in our line of country the individual trees are often as important as the wood. A proper perspective will keep both in sight. Certainly there is a danger at the moment of the theological historians becoming too fastidious in determining the facts they will choose to see. Richardson himself for instance asserts with some emphasis against Bultmann that the resurrection of Christ is a particular historical event. On the other

² Longmans, 30s.

hand, he adds, "the ascension need not be thought of as an historical event, unless it be that of the last resurrection appearance to the disciples." What is the difference that forces the two events into such widely different categories? Here as in our own columns there seems some lingering ambiguity about the conception and capacities of a "spiritual" body. If such a body is capable of entering a sealed room could it not also be capable of levitation until the "cloud received him out of their sight"? Again, supposing that the resurrection appearances are no more than "veridical visions", could not the ascension be the same? If these questions were cleared away it is probable that the resurrection and ascension would appear in modern theology as they do in the creeds—on precisely the same level of credibility.

A final and most refreshing element in Dr Richardson's book is that it works up to a grand climax in the theology of the Eucharist. "It is only in the eucharistic worship of the Church that the theology of the New Testament can be truly understood." He claims that since it is the sacrament of our creation and preservation as well as of our redemption and final salvation, the Eucharist gathers up into itself all the aspirations of natural religion as well as the whole meaning of the revelation in Jesus Christ. True enough! Many of us have often said much the same thing in the peroration of a sermon. But to find it worked out in the culminating chapter of a most up-to-date, post-critical work of modern theology, this is a portent indeed. We hope it will give fresh heart of grace to the parochial clergy and set them once again to catch up on their studies, knowing that their theological labour will not be in vain for the edification of souls.

LAMBETH AND UNITY

E. L. MASCALL

IN ADDRESSING the Oxford Diocesan Conference on 5 November 1958 on the subject of the recent Lambeth Conference, the Bishop of Oxford took pains to emphasize that "the book published" at the end of August containing the Resolutions of the Conference and the Report of the Committees is in no way exempt from criticism. Bishops who were members of the Conference", Dr Carpenter continued, "may, and probably will, express disagreement with some things contained in it; clergy and lay people may properly and usefully criticise, provided that they have taken the trouble to read and study what has been said."¹ It is in the spirit of these words that I offer some comments on that part of the Lambeth Conference Report which is concerned with Christian unity. For convenience I shall use the term "Lambeth" or "the Conference" to mean the Lambeth Conference of 1958, "the Report" to mean the Report of the Conference as a whole, and "the Committee Report" to mean the Report of the Committee of the Conference on Church Unity and the Church Universal, a document which, it must be remembered, has only the authority of the Committee which produced it except in so far as its contents were endorsed by Resolutions of the Conference itself. The precise significance of those Resolutions, which the Report had left somewhat obscure, has been clarified in a statement made by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Convocation of Canterbury in October,² from which it appears that, with the exception of the Resolution (No. 106) concerning nuclear warfare, on which a definite division of conviction was recorded, the appearance of a Resolution in the Report means simply that any minority which may have voted against it did not ask for its dissent to be registered, but not necessarily that the Resolution in question was passed unanimously.

Christian Unity

The Committee Report opens with a statement on Christian Unity which was welcomed and endorsed by the Conference in Resolution 13. Much of this is admirable; it is recognized that the ultimate reunion of Christendom must involve the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches no less than the non-episcopal bodies. The Lambeth Quadrilateral is reaffirmed as stated by the Lambeth

Conference of 1920, and the conviction is expressed that "a ministry to be acknowledged by every part of the Church can only be attained through the historic episcopate, though not necessarily in the precise form prevailing in any part of the Anglican Communion".³ Comment is perhaps needed on the statement that "all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity are incorporated into the Body of Christ and are members of the Church",⁴ without reference to the question whether baptism unsupplemented by any further ceremony confers full or only partial membership. The question is important, not only because many Anglicans hold that full Christian initiation involves a complex consisting of baptism, confirmation, and participation in the Eucharist, but because also many non-episcopal bodies confine the right to communion and the term "full membership of the Church" to those whose baptism has been supplemented by a rite which is conferred only upon adults. Furthermore, nothing is said about the question, which has considerably exercised theologians in recent years, whether there can be degrees of membership and if so how these are to be understood. Is a man's membership of the Church impaired, for example, if he adheres to the Arian or the monophysite heresy? Or if he belongs to a body which lacks that episcopal ministry which, in the words of the Committee, "we believe to have been given to the Church by Divine Providence from primitive Christian times"?⁵ In the absence of any reference to such questions as these the unqualified statement of the Committee Report can easily be misleading.

A useful simplification in current usage is provided by the suggestion that the term "full communion" should be used to signify unrestricted *communio in sacris*, including the mutual recognition of ministries, all other degrees of relation between Christian bodies being described as "intercommunion".

Under the heading "Wider Episcopal Fellowship" the Conference, in Resolution 16, reaffirmed a resolution of the Conference of 1948 and recommended the Archbishop of Canterbury to convoke, within the next five years, a conference consisting of representative bishops not only of the Anglican Communion but also of all Churches with which any Anglican Church or Province is in either full communion or a relation of intercommunion. In Resolution 17 it also noted and commended to the attention of the President and the Consultative Body, but without expressing either approval or

disapproval, a suggestion of the Committee that future Lambeth Conferences should contain bishops of any united Church into which, with the encouragement and goodwill of the Lambeth Conference, any Anglican church has entered. Both these proposals need careful scrutiny and it is difficult to form an opinion upon them until the status of the Lambeth Conference itself has been clarified. Theoretically a Lambeth Conference is simply an informal gathering of bishops for mutual discussion and advice; it has no legislative authority whatever. Nor would any such authority attach to the wider conference suggested in Resolution 16. There is, however, a disquieting tendency to view Lambeth Conferences as at least approximating, in spite of their theoretically informal nature, to the status of supreme legislative bodies for the Anglican Communion. A tendency is noticeable in the Report to speak not merely of "Lambeth Conferences", as would be strictly correct in view of the fact that there is no canonical need for their existence, but of "the Lambeth Conference", which appears to be conceived as an entity having a permanent although intermittent existence. All the indications are that Lambeth Conferences have reached a point at which they must move in the direction of either very much more or very much less importance; and if (which I myself should regret) they, or a wider episcopal body, were to achieve a kind of quasi-legislative status, the question of their composition would become highly important and controversial. This composition is not my subject here, but its bearing on Resolutions 16 and 17 cannot be ignored.

South India

The Committee Report begins its detailed examination of the reunion question with a section on the Church of South India, which the Conference "welcomed and endorsed" in Resolution 18. This section is largely factual and useful, in its description of the relations established between C.S.I. and the various parts of the Anglican Communion. When, however, it comes to pass judgement on the present state and future prospects of the C.S.I. the Committee Report becomes quite uncritically laudatory, going so far as to suggest that, in spite of its recent and somewhat equivocal adoption of episcopacy, the C.S.I. can teach a great deal about episcopacy to the Churches of the West. Now I do not wish in the least to appear unfriendly to the C.S.I. or unappreciative of the very

definite move which it has made towards the acquirement of full Catholic status. Friendship itself would, however, suggest that some indication should be given of the ambiguities that still need to be removed if that status, and with it, full communion with the Anglican Churches, is to be acquired. It is therefore surprising that nothing about this is said in the Report. No comment is made upon the fact that the "six points" of the well-known "Derby Report" have never been satisfactorily answered, though it is remarked in passing that the Province of the West Indies has deferred its judgement on C.S.I. until the constitution of the C.S.I. has received the modification that their acceptance would entail. No comment is made upon the practices of using unfermented fruit-juice at the Eucharist and of returning the unused consecrated species to the bottle for use at future services. These practices were brought to the notice of members of the Committee and are moreover mentioned in a manual⁶ which was published in 1952 and reprinted in 1954 at the Madras Diocesan Press, so it is difficult to suppose the Committee was ignorant of them unless it was singularly uninformed. A further point has recently emerged which makes it more difficult to suppose that the C.S.I. is so steadily and uniformly moving to full Catholic status that no word of advice or warning would be salutary.

In a letter to the *Church Times* of 7 November 1958 the Archbishop of Wales commented on a speech made by Bishop Newbigin of the C.S.I. in the previous September, in which it was asserted that "the Church [of South India] has shown itself ready without the slightest hesitation to go beyond the Basis of Union in welcoming into its ministry men not episcopally ordained, even though they did not come from one of the parent Churches." As Dr Morris pointed out, such a practice would permanently jeopardize the prospects of full communion between Anglicanism and the C.S.I. It is true that Bishop Newbigin's speech was made after the Lambeth Conference Report was issued, though another correspondent asserted⁷ that the new policy was announced in a broadcast a year earlier, on 15 September 1957, and was then brought to the notice of some Anglican bishops. In any case, the Lambeth Conference would seem to have been singularly ill-informed as to what was happening in the C.S.I., for, since the existing regulations of the various Anglican Churches about their relations with C.S.I. were based upon the understanding that the

Basis of Union was binding, the irregularity could hardly have been looked on as irrelevant. It can only be feared that the unqualified approval given to the C.S.I. by Lambeth may encourage the C.S.I. to make further experiments in a non-Catholic direction.

It is of interest to notice at this point that the General Convention of the Episcopal Church of the U.S.A., meeting shortly after the Lambeth Conference, showed itself to be much more realistic about C.S.I. than were the Lambeth fathers. For it not only defined its relations to C.S.I. in a set of resolutions more restrictive than those adopted by any other branch of the Anglican Communion, but also prefaced them by a statement listing four definitely anomalous characteristics of C.S.I. and then, for greater security, transformed this Preamble into a further set of resolutions

North India and Pakistan

FROM South India, where union has now been an accomplished fact for over eleven years, the Report turns to consider the *Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon* (Lanka) and the *Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan*. Both these differ from the South India pattern in that they propose to unify the ministry of the constituent Churches at the start, and hope by so doing to establish immediate relations of full communion with all the parent bodies outside India. The Report for the most part discusses the *Scheme* and the *Plan* together, and with certain reservations, mainly concerned with the *Plan*, expresses approval of both. There is, however, one very relevant difference between them to which the Report pays no attention. In Ceylon the Christians involved in the *Scheme* are, approximately, 39,000 Anglicans (of whom 19,000 are communicants) and 35,000 non-Anglicans (of whom 16,000 are communicants); the non-Anglicans belong to the Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian Churches and to the Jaffna Diocese of C.S.I.⁸ Thus, whether we count the communicants or the total Christian community, in either case the Anglicans form a definite majority over the non-Anglicans. In North India and Pakistan, on the other hand, according to an article by Bishop Noel Hall, formerly Bishop of Chota Nagpur,⁹ the Anglicans number about 250,000, while the non-Anglicans include 500,000 "episcopal" Methodists of American background, 400,000 members of the United Church of North India (itself a union of Presbyterian and Congregational churches), 10,000 Methodists of British and Australasian affiliation, and a

large but unspecified number of Baptists; there are also about 10,000 members of the Church of the Brethren and some members of the Disciples of Christ. Bishop de Mel, the Bishop of Kurunagala in Ceylon, has estimated the Anglicans as amounting to only 20 per cent of the whole, and, in his words, "it amounts almost to total disappearance".¹⁰ In other words, while the Ceylon Scheme may be not unreasonably described as a scheme for bringing non-Anglicans into the Anglican unity, the North India and Pakistan Plan would seem to be, as far as Anglicans are concerned, a plan for absorbing Anglicans into an undifferentiated Protestant mass. Furthermore, the dominant group of Episcopal Methodists, which alone is twice the size of the Anglican Church in the area, is, from the point of view of Catholic Christianity, one of the least satisfactory of Protestant bodies. In Bishop Hall's words, it "has not avoided the danger of being content with superficial professions and of acquiescing too readily in the survival of Hindu practices after conversion".¹¹ Now, where the Anglican body is in the majority, no very special safeguards of the distinctive doctrines and practices of Anglicanism might appear to be necessary, for, by the mere process of voting, any disputed points would naturally be interpreted in a sense at least consistent with the Anglican position; where, on the other hand, Anglicans are liable to be outvoted by four to one, only the most explicit safeguards can prevent the Anglican values from being swamped. Thus, from the point of view of Anglicanism it would seem to be far more important to have a thoroughly watertight project for North India and Pakistan than for Ceylon. What we find, however, is just the opposite. As Lambeth itself recognized, the *Scheme* is much better from the Anglican standpoint than the *Plan*. What Lambeth does not seem to have recognized is that to prevent the essential features of the Anglican position from being swamped in North India it is not sufficient to have forms of words that can be interpreted in either a Catholic or a Protestant sense, but to have forms whose meaning is unambiguous. The question that has to be asked at every point of the *Plan* is not, "Can I interpret this in a Catholic sense?" but, "Can the Catholic interpretation of this survive in the face of a four-to-one Protestant vote?" This is an issue that, so far as can be seen from the Report, Lambeth never squarely faced. It is noteworthy that, in the article to which I have referred, the Bishop of Kurunagala, who is an enthusiastic

supporter of the *Scheme*, shows himself as being much less happy about the *Plan*.

It is against this background that one may feel bound to question the assertion of the Lambeth Committee that the doctrinal statements of both *Plan* and *Scheme* are "unexceptionable" and that "no Anglican need entertain any doubt concerning the orthodoxy of the Faith of the resulting Churches".¹² It must be noted that, while both the *Scheme* and the *Plan* "accept" the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, only the *Scheme* orders either to be used in preparation for Baptism and Confirmation; a communicant in North India or Pakistan may apparently never have heard of the existence of either. And what does the word "accept" imply? Does it mean that the denial of the teaching of the Creeds will be treated as a heresy, or only that the Creeds will be tucked away somewhere in a hymn-book, to be used or not according to taste?

In addition to its own somewhat sketchy statement of the Doctrines of the Church, the *Plan* lists a number of confessional documents of the uniting bodies for use after the union. From the Anglican side there is contributed Declaration I of the Constitution of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon, though not the Prayer Book Catechism. Then there is the very detailed Confession of Faith of the United Church of Northern India, consisting of a markedly Protestant set of twelve articles with a Preamble on which I shall comment in a moment. Thirdly there is a space for the insertion of further doctrinal statements. Thus the *Plan* is very heavily weighted doctrinally on the Protestant side, for while the Confession of the U.C.N.I. is a comprehensive statement of doctrine, Declaration I of the C.I.P.B.C. makes no such pretensions. The Preamble to the U.C.N.I. Confession lists as "worthy exponents of the word of God and as systems of doctrine to be taught in our Churches and seminaries" five of the confessional statements of the continental Reformation; as some of these are Calvinist and others are Lutheran they are not in fact mutually consistent. No reason is stated in the *Plan* for their inclusion, but one would naturally assume that they are meant to indicate the doctrinal standard of the new Church and that their inconsistencies have either been overlooked or else ignored as unimportant; though in either case the doctrinal prospects from the Anglican point of view would be disquieting. Lambeth, however, tries to allay this alarm by revealing what it assures us is the real reason for the inclusion of

this miscellaneous list of confessional statements. The primary reason for their insertion, it tells us, is not to express the faith of the Church but "to secure the legal continuity of the united Church with the Churches from which its membership will be derived, and for the safeguarding of property".¹³ The evidence for this interpretation is not given, but in any case I cannot say that I find it reassuring. The moral aspect of the question does not seem to be negligible, for if the doctrines for the propagation of which the various Churches acquired their property are mutually inconsistent their merging in a common organization is difficult to justify on ethical or legal grounds. And the doctrinal aspect is equally unsatisfactory, for if the principle which is implied is generally accepted it will be impossible to place reliance on the doctrinal affirmations of any religious body; we shall always be liable to be told of any article of belief that it was included not because it was believed to be true but merely to avoid losing property which had been originally acquired for its propagation. I can only hope that Lambeth was mistaken in ascribing to the parties to the *Plan* a motive which would hardly be to their credit.

The part of the *Scheme* and of the *Plan* which has caused most difficulty is that which is concerned with the ceremony for unifying the ministries of the uniting bodies. In spite of appeals to adopt a more realistic approach to the problem, such as those which were made by the Theological Committee of the Church Union in 1957,¹⁴ the negotiating committee persisted in its determination to devise a form of words which, with laying-on of hands, could be said by the parties indiscriminately over each other, even if the Anglicans and the non-Anglicans had quite different ideas about what they were intending to do. In the *Plan* the matter is complicated by the existence of the "bishops" of the Episcopal Methodist body, who, in spite of the fact that they have never professed to be bishops in the Catholic sense, insisted on being treated in the same way as the Anglican bishops. The *Plan* has indeed tried to draw a distinction between "the special link with the Episcopate of the primitive Church which the Anglican Communion claims to have preserved" and "the spiritual heritage of the Episcopal branch of the Methodist Communion", while obstinately insisting on communicating these two very different things by the same verbal formula, but the unreality of this is seen in the fact that no one would have thought of using the method of prayer with laying-on of hands to communicate

the latter of these effects were it not clearly necessary for the communication of the former. There is one modification in the formula of unification which the Lambeth Committee recommended, in order to clear up a confusion as to whether the purpose of the unification ceremony is to secure that all the ministers who have undergone it shall be ministers of the universal Church of God or only ministers of the local Church of Ceylon, North India, or Pakistan; it urged that in every case mention of the Church of God should precede mention of the local Church, and the Conference in Resolution 24 expressed the belief that full communion between the new Church and the Anglican Churches would be possible if this recommendation was accepted. The ambiguity has not, however, been satisfactorily removed and it is still not clear whether, if a fresh Church comes into the union after its initial inauguration, this whole business of unification will have to be performed over again and, if so, what its significance will then be. It must be added that, while the "Derby Committee", of theologians and others, was consulted on the question of necessary and desirable modifications to the *Plan*, it is generally believed that not all its recommendations were accepted by the Committee of the Conference.

I have commented in a recent pamphlet¹⁵ upon the other recommendations which the Committee proposed for modifications in the *Plan*; it is disquieting to observe that the Conference itself only pressed for those which affect the unification ceremony. If this was an oversight it was a very unfortunate one. With these modifications the Conference considered that full communion between the Anglican Churches and the new Churches in Ceylon, North India, and Pakistan would be immediately possible. I have given in my pamphlet some reasons for supposing that, while the Ceylon Scheme, in spite of some blemishes, is just tolerable, the North India and Pakistan Plan is questionable in the extreme. Here I will only stress the fact that the decision about entering into full communion is purely a matter for each of the Anglican Churches to decide for itself; the C.I.P.B.C. would be acting most rashly and irresponsibly if it went into the union simply on the strength of an opinion of the Lambeth Conference, without consulting each branch of the Anglican Communion first. I shall conclude this part of the discussion with some remarks about the crucial point in the unification rite, namely whether it is intended to confer episcopal ordination on the non-episcopally ordained ministers who undergo it.

At an early stage in the negotiations an explicit statement was inserted in the *Plan* to the effect that, whatever the unification rite was, it was "not re-ordination". Does this imply that it is an ordination or not? The natural reply would seem to be in the negative, and there is little doubt that most of the non-Anglicans involved have interpreted it in that way. In fact they have been encouraged in this belief by at least one prominent Anglican member of the Negotiating Committee, though it appears to have been since made plain that in this he was expressing nothing more than his own personal opinion. On the other hand, advocates of the *Plan* have frequently assured Anglo-Catholics that from the Anglican point of view the rite is an ordination of the non-Anglicans although it is only a commissioning of the Anglicans, and this interpretation has somewhat dubiously got into the Lambeth Committee's Report in the assertion that "From the Anglican point of view . . . the rite is intended to convey everything of value in the Anglican ministry, including the tradition of episcopal ordination".¹⁶ Somewhat dubiously, I have said, because at least one prominent Anglican of long experience in ecumenical affairs has not seen it in this way. In a long article in the *Church of England Newspaper* of 28 November 1958 Bishop Stephen Neill has written as follows:

It seems to me that, when the verbiage has been pared away, the answer of Lambeth is negative—this is not episcopal ordination. If this is so, episcopal ordination is no longer necessary as a prerequisite to full communion between Anglican and non-Anglican Churches.

Bishop Neill sees this decision as marking nothing less than the abandonment of the traditional Anglican attitude towards the non-episcopal bodies:

Since 1662 the Anglican Churches have proceeded on the understanding that nothing is equivalent to episcopal ordination except episcopal ordination If any man wishes to minister in an Anglican Church anywhere in the world, he is asked to produce evidence of his episcopal ordination

The Church of England does not presume to pronounce on the authority or effectiveness of the ministry that a man may have exercised as a Methodist or a Presbyterian. It simply *affirms* that that is not ministry as we have understood it, and that there is no way into our ministry other than episcopal ordination.

The commendation of the Ceylon and North India schemes appears to rest on a rather different set of theological presuppositions.

Apparently all the ministers of all the uniting churches are regarded as having exercised in separation much the same kind of ministry, though with the limitations involved in our separations. Now, with the Union, these ministries are to receive an extension of sphere, and, as we may hope, fresh authority and power to discharge their duties more fully.

I cannot think that Bishop Neill has seriously taken into consideration the sentence in the Report which I have quoted above, but if an ecumenist as experienced as he is has overlooked it, we may well doubt whether it will have been noticed by the rank and file of negotiators and advocates for reunion. It may seem disrespectful to suggest that the bishops at Lambeth took insufficient care to make their meaning really plain, but something like this would seem to be implied by Bishop Neill himself when he writes :

It is when we come to the schemes for union in Ceylon and North India that the bishops have really gone full steam ahead and charged impetuously through jungles of difficulties.

We seem in fact to be exposed to two dangers; the first is that of jeopardizing the Catholic ministry, the second is that of misleading non-Anglicans. It is quite certain that the Catholic-minded bishops at Lambeth, of whom there were a great many, would never have allowed Resolutions 23 and 24 to pass without registering a protest unless they had been convinced that the unification ceremony was intended to confer episcopal ordination upon the non-Anglicans; it is at least not unlikely that the non-Anglicans will refuse to go on with the *Scheme* and the *Plan* unless they are convinced that the Anglicans have no such intention. The temptation to exploit any ambiguities or imprecisions in the Report is thus immense, and Bishop Neill's article is a manifestation of it. Unless the whole project is to culminate in a welter of misunderstandings and re-criminations, it is essential that the precise bearing of the Lambeth Resolutions should be made clear. For, on any count, it would be better for the reunion project to be broken off altogether than for non-Anglicans to have episcopal ordination foisted on them when they neither desired it nor suspected that they were being given it.

Two other matters call for comment before we leave North India, Pakistan, and Ceylon. First, as the Lambeth Committee recognized, the permission in the *Scheme* and the *Plan* for occasional visiting non-episcopally ordained ministers to celebrate Holy Communion is

“a serious departure from Anglican practice”.¹⁷ Nevertheless the Committee held that this permission “cannot reasonably be held to cast doubt upon the clearly expressed intention of the Churches to maintain the ministry of bishop, presbyter, and deacon” and that “the Churches of the Anglican Communion should not, on that account, have any hesitation in accepting the ministry of the resulting Churches as fully accredited and in historic continuity with that of the undivided Church”. In Resolution 21 the Conference endorsed this judgement, with a proviso about respecting the consciences of worshippers. Is there an element of wishful thinking here? Can we be sure that, for example, the North-Indian union, dominated as it will be by the 500,000 ex-Methodists and the 400,000 ex-members of the U.C.N.I., will agree with the Lambeth Committee in characterizing this kind of permission as an anomaly? For—and this is my second comment—in spite of their practice of “unifying”, any minister, whether episcopally or non-episcopally ordained, who comes to work in them permanently, the united Churches will, so it is proposed, be in full communion with *all* the parent bodies. Bishop Neill has seen the kind of awkward situations to which this state of affairs will lead, even if Lambeth has not. For instance, he asks :

If a Methodist returning from Ceylon can enter into the Anglican ministry on the strength of the special ceremony in Ceylon, are we right in continuing to treat the Methodist minister in England who wishes to enter the Anglican priesthood as though he was an unconfirmed Anglican layman? Is not this method of procedure possibly out of date?

We can at least agree with Bishop Neill that, although such questions as these are a little remote, “they all have to be taken into consideration, before an Anglican province makes up its mind whether to accept or reject the recommendation of the bishops at Lambeth that it should enter into full communion with the new United Churches”. I only wonder whether all the bishops at Lambeth were as far-seeing as Bishop Neill.

Presbyterianism and Methodism

As regards the Presbyterian Churches, Lambeth did not get much further than the Report of the conversations between Anglican and Presbyterians which was published in 1957. The Lambeth Committee made the remarkable assertion that “the Anglican Churches ought to be ready to recognize the Presbyterian Churches as true parts of the

One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, and that the spiritual effectiveness of their ministerial orders ought not to be implicitly or explicitly questioned", though it made the important qualification that "Anglicans conscientiously hold that the celebrant of the Eucharist should have been ordained by a bishop standing in the historic succession".¹⁸ Perhaps it was for this reason that the Conference, in Resolutions 25 to 28, did little more than commend for study the 1957 Report and almost ignored the Report of its own Committee on the subject, merely commending its comments for further discussion. The extremely negative reception which the 1957 Report has been given by Presbyterians in Scotland would seem to leave little hope for action along the lines that it recommended, but I cannot feel that the Presbyterians have been entirely wrong in their reaction. For, as I have suggested in recent contributions to this *Review*,¹⁹ the real points at issue between Anglicanism and Presbyterianism were never properly explored: priesthood is involved quite as much as episcopacy, as the Bishop of Brechin has shown in a recent article,²⁰ but, while episcopacy and *episcopé* were discussed at length, priesthood was hardly mentioned. It is understandable that Presbyterians have been suspicious that Episcopacy-in-Presbytery was rather like a noxious pill concealed in jam.

Again, as regards the Methodists the Conference could do little more than take note of the conversations now proceeding in England and America and encourage them to continue. The interim report of the English conversations is one of the best documents that have appeared in the field of reunion discussions, largely because it did not attempt to do too much. However, signs are already evident that there are difficulties ahead, for the teaching about the ministry in the Deed of Union of 1932²¹ (a document which has parliamentary authority and is not open to amendment) seems to be flatly contradictory not only to the teaching of the Church of England but also to that of the Methodist ordinal itself.

Conclusion

On the remainder of the Committee Report only brief remarks need be made. The Conference agreed with it in recommending Ceylon as the pattern for West Africa. It had nothing very definite to say about relations with the Roman Catholic, Eastern, Old Catholic, and Scandinavian Churches, though we may note here that the recent decision of the Swedish Church, under pressure from the State, to

ordain women to the ministry is bound to have repercussions on its relations with the Anglican Churches. The approval of the consecration by Anglican prelates of bishops for the Spanish Reformed Episcopal and the Lusitanian Church, though not difficult to justify in principle, raises issues whose full significance may not have been realized. The section of the Committee Report dealing with the World Council of Churches is valuable if only for its quotation of statements in which the W.C.C. itself recognizes its limitations and refuses to make assumptions of the pandenominational type so dear to many ecumenical enthusiasts.

The final judgement which I find myself making upon the Church Unity section of the Lambeth Report is inevitably a mixed one. Parts of it are excellent; parts, it must be confessed, show signs of hasty and confused thought and decision. Nor is this to be wondered at, when one considers the pressure at which the Conference worked. The Reverend John G. Williams, of the Editorial Department of S.P.C.K., has described in the November 1958 issue of *View-Review* the production of the Report from the angle of the publisher. It was clearly a superb technical triumph, with trains being met at Norwich at 2.30 a.m., compositors working all night at Beccles, drafts and proofs passing backwards and forwards. But it does not leave the impression that, working as they were with one eye on the clock and the other on the calender, the Lambeth fathers were in the best situation for cool and unhurried thought. It is thus in no spirit of disrespect that one reflects with relief that, in spite of its geographically if not constitutionally or theologically representative character, the Lambeth Conference has no formal or official authority, and that the final decision upon the vast multitude of matters which it discussed rests with the individual Churches of the Anglican Communion.

1 *Oxford Diocesan Magazine*, No. 669, p. 278 (Dec. 1958).

2 See the *Church Times* of 10 Oct. 1958, p. 1.

3 *Report*, Part 2, p. 22.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 21.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 22.

6 T. S. Garrett, *The Liturgy of the Church of South India*.

7 *Church Times*, 28 Nov. 1958, letter from the Rev. James Hutton.

8 These figures are taken from an appendix to the *Scheme*.

9 See *Faith and Unity*, No. 103 (April 1958).

10 See *Australian Board of Missions Review*, December 1955.

11 *Art. cit. supra*.

12 *Report*, Part 2, p. 31.

13 *Ibid.*

14 *The Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan: a memorandum* . . . , pp. 6f.

¹⁵ *Lambeth 1958 and Christian Unity*, published by the Faith Press.

¹⁶ *Report*, Part 2, p. 32.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 43-4

¹⁹ C.Q.R., Jan.-Mar. and Oct.-Dec. 1958 (pp. 5f and 568f), with a rejoinder by Dr H. E. W. Turner, July-Sept. 1958 (pp. 351f).

²⁰ Eric Graham, "Priesthood and Reunion", C.Q.R., Oct.-Dec. 1958 (pp. 473f).

²¹ Cf. my comments in *The Recovery of Unity*, pp. 157f.

FAITH IN THE TRINITY*

R. V. SELLERS

And the Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity. (The Athanasian Creed.)

THERE must be many sincere Christians of our Communion, who, especially to-day, are finding the Church's traditional presentation of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity a source of real difficulty and perplexity. These, in their faith, will be ready to confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, Son of God, Saviour, that over all is the Father, that the Holy Spirit, the gift of Christ to his Church, is their "other Comforter"—that theirs is the simple creed, "I believe in God, Father Son and Holy Spirit". But when they hear that there is one Person of the Father, "made of none, neither created nor begotten", another Person of the Son, "begotten of the Father before the worlds", and another Person of the Holy Ghost, "proceeding from the Father and the Son"—three Persons, but one God, one Substance which is not to be divided—they are frankly bewildered and begin to ask pertinent questions.

Has it to be inferred, they may ask, that all this is a mysterious dogma concerning the Being of God, which has been revealed to the Church by God himself, and which is to be received on authority, even if it be not understood? Or—How can the finite mind be so lacking in reverence and intellectual modesty as even to attempt to describe the essence of the Most High? Must not the result be pure speculation? And after all, is not Christianity a life, not an intellectual assent to a series of theological propositions? Or, from the practical point of view—Of what value to-day are formulas, which, while they may have expressed the ideas of a former age, must seem pathetically unreal to the modern mind?

But, we reply, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity does not come to us by way of direct divine revelation. As has been said, "not truth about God, but the living God Himself" is offered to man's apprehension in any specific revelation.¹ God is revealed through his mighty acts, the significance of which calls for human interpretation; and in the process of truth-seeking it is realized that doctrinal decisions are not irreformable, and that the infallible authority is God himself, who will not suffer his truth to fail.

* A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on Trinity Sunday, 1958.

Nor can we accept the verdict that the Trinitarian doctrine contained in the Church's formularies amounts to no more than a piece of speculation on the part of her theologians. From first to last, it has to be insisted, the Church's expressed belief has its roots in Christian experience. Christianity is indeed a life, but it is a life involving the whole man, and if a man is to love the Lord his God with all his mind, and not to neglect the gift of the Spirit to lead him into all the truth, he must needs attempt to secure for himself a reasonable interpretation of that to which his heart responds. And it is just this attempt to interpret the facts of Christian experience which, as we shall see, has its outcome in the Church's doctrinal statements.

Again, it is true that her doctrine of the Trinity is expressed in the thought-forms of a bygone age. But before we criticize, it is of the utmost importance that we should first try to understand what lies behind them. In setting up their theology, the theologians of the early Church were appealing not only to the heart but also to the mind of their contemporaries: with the aid of Greek science, they were in effect proclaiming to the Greek world that Christianity has to be reckoned with as a rational religion; and that, in its doctrine of God and his relations with his creation, it provides man with the key to his intellectual problems.

As is only too plain, a similar task should be ours to-day, confronted as we are with the shaking not of the earth only, but also of the heavens—when, in the opinion of a recent writer, “the real battle for the soul of men and nations is now just about to begin”.² For if the Church is to gain an intellectual hold on the modern mind—and failure here, as it seems, would bring with it failure in the moral and solely religious spheres of human life—Christians must needs demonstrate to the world of to-day, as did the ancients to their world, that the doctrine of the Trinity with its manifold implications stands as the master-light to man in quest for truth. And we may anticipate that, without necessarily discarding the ancient formulas, we shall be able to express in modern idiom the truths which these are meant to convey—as, under God, we press forward in the task.

It behoves us, then, on this Trinity Sunday, to look into the foundations of the doctrine of the Triune-Unity of God, that we may appreciate its supreme importance as that which gives meaning to the life of man and of the world in which he finds himself—

and more than this, that we may see for ourselves that it is only as man and creation are in proper relationship to the One God in three Persons, and, through him, in proper relationship to each other, that together they can enjoy that fullness of life which, we affirm, is their great destiny.

Religion begins, not with man, but with God—man being so made that he can respond to the divine initiative; and according to our Gospel, the living and personal God has manifested himself supremely in the unfolding purpose of redemption which has its climax in the coming of Jesus Christ—in his life, death, and resurrection—and in the outpouring of his Spirit upon men responsive to these, the most wondrous of God's "mighty acts". From the first, Christians were convinced that "God" was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, and that the coming of newness of life through the power of the Spirit—whom, in view of the character of his work, they described as the "Holy" Spirit—could likewise be nothing less than the work of God himself in personal contact with those who believed. Of the eternal existence of the Father Almighty, God over all, they were fully assured. But how were they to interpret these other distinct experiences and still maintain the monotheistic belief they had inherited from the old Israel?

The solution, "One substance in Three Persons", was reached only after the Church had fought her way through various forms of unitarianism, and shown that she was not working on lines of rational proof, but was immediately concerned with the truth of divine self-revelation: the three divine activities, continuous and eternal, are the activities of each of the three Persons within the one Divine substance—three distinct ways of existing, three relationships, three properties within the unity of the Godhead. And whatever may have been the particular shade of meaning which Fathers and Schoolmen gave to the term "person", they certainly did not mean, when speaking of the three Persons, three separate minds, three wills: there cannot be three Gods or three Lords, or three Almighties—there can be only one "Ruler of all".

To leave aside this technical language: what the doctrine of the Trinity teaches us at the outset—as, led to the Invisible through the visible, we would peer into the mystery of the divine Being in the light of the revelation of himself in space and time—is that, according to our faith, God whom we know as Spirit, Light, and Love is himself eternally active, and that, in consequence, to be creative is

of his eternal Self. Though, like our power of perception, our power of imagery is conditioned by our creaturely limitations, we venture to speak of the eternal "begetting" of the Son by the Father, and of the "procession" of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son—terms which carry with them the idea of a continual process within the divine unity itself. The three Persons, we say, "cleave" to each other, and consist in that Unity; we envisage that "revolving circle of glory" which "passes from Like to Like", as the Son is glorified by the Spirit, and the Father by the Son, and, as we contemplate the mystery of the Three in One and the One in Three, we are made aware that in the eternal and inseparable activities of the three Persons lies the perfection of him who is perfect as One.

And this is he who is "the God of the world". Such a formula as "God *and* the world" will not do: in view of the truth which science is giving us, it represents far too narrow a conception of God. The whole world stands as "his own", even if it contains evil as well as good. But the God of the world is the God of purpose. Sin may abound, but grace abounds all the more—and it will continue to abound all the more till the day of final victory and perfected peace.

So "he that was", and "that is", is "he that comes"—the one God. But how does he "come"? He comes in the three activities of the three Persons—the three conscious centres of activity—in their "mutual relatedness" within the Divine Unity. And here we may well adopt terms employed by the Cappadocian Father, Basil of Caesarea,⁴ and say—that the Father is the original cause, by whose will all things are, and who cannot be separated from the Son the creative cause, or from the Holy Spirit the perfecting cause; that the Son operates as the likeness of the Father, his work being perfected by the Spirit; and that, in a sense "third"—though, as we shall see, first in the order of our experience of God's movement towards his creation—the Spirit in his perfecting activity makes strong and complete what has been created by the Son in accordance with the Father's will.

In their mutual relatedness, the Father "wills", the Son "creates", and the Holy Spirit "perfects": it would seem a most inspiring thought.

How true is this description of the activities of the Three in One is plain when we turn to the Person of Jesus Christ, in whom, we affirm, God himself has "come" once and for all. From first to last,

conscious of his personal relation to the Father, and of his relation to the world as the Anointed One through whom God's age-long purpose was to be fulfilled, he lives in and through the Father's will: that will is ever transparent in him who does "nothing of himself", and in utter obedience is brought step by step to the Cross and the glory that followed. Accordingly, our interpretation of this uninterrupted unity with the Father is that it is the outcome of the creating work of him by whom all things were made. The divine Word, we affirm, has so united to himself "the Man of Christ"—a complete manhood, that is—that in the one Person of the Word made flesh there is but one will—a will which is at once divine and human; consequently, we believe that in Jesus Christ a completely new creation has come into being. Further, since the Holy Spirit could move freely and fully in "the Man of Christ"—as well in the unconscious, we may assume, as in the conscious—that manhood is perfect at its every stage and circumstance, till at last, tried to the uttermost, it is made perfect through suffering; and Christ, the author of eternal salvation, rises from the dead, and ascends into heaven with "all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature".

Thus in Christ heaven's gate is flung wide open, and what is within made manifest to us: the God of infinite love, the eternally righteous One who is judge of all, the God on whom all depends—even the God who is ever willing the end, ever creating that it may be realized, and ever perfecting what he creates. And that end, even the mystery of the divine will, is now unfolded to us in Christ: Christ the new creation comes to us as *princeps in omnibus*, that in him all things may be gathered up in one—the one existing in the many, and the many finding their meaning in the one. Nothing less than the exaltation of human nature and the consumption of the universe in Jesus Christ, with the removal of every discord, is the content of God's ineffable purpose for his world.

Unsearchable indeed are God's judgements, and his ways past finding out. Nevertheless, for us in this world the veil has been raised in Christ, and with the coming of the Christian Church it seems possible to discern how, through a movement which is all the while inward and upward, he who is eternally active is bringing his creation to himself.

Christian experience tells us that the movement begins with the activity of the Holy Spirit. Baffled though the Spirit may be on

account of that mass of humanity which is content to adapt itself to its temporal environment, he works through the few—though only that through the few the universal purpose may be realized. And, with them and in them, he does not “speak of himself”, but, as “the ladder of ascent to God”,⁵ leads them to Christ, in whom the creative and, at the same time, redemptive activity of the Word is manifested in its fulness; so that being “in Christ” and partaking of that same activity, they are created anew and given fresh standing before God in his righteousness and his love. And into these new creations the perfecting Spirit pours that most “abundant” life which Christ has procured for the world. The like of it—as it appears in responsive souls where the Spirit finds his freest activity—has never been seen before: its pattern is that of the perfect union of the material and the spiritual which appears in Christ himself. Further, those who are “in the Spirit” and “in Christ” know that they are also in communion with the Father on high—for it seems impossible to say where one activity begins and another ends—and Christ’s, “I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfectly one”, is indicative of the culmination of the whole movement. Not that these are already made perfect, but even now, living “as well in flesh as in spirit”, and at home in God’s world, they are convinced that, guided by the divine Spirit into all the truth, and strengthened by him in the inner man—as he works not only in the conscious but also in those “Titanic glooms of chasméd fears”—they will at length reach their glorious destiny.

Further, the same pattern of the divine working appears in former ages, it seems, when man was being prepared to receive in the fullness of the times this one magnificent picture of a united heaven and earth, which, to embody his ideas, was woven by God himself in his manifold wisdom. From man’s first appearance, God left not himself without witness in the natural creation, and, we assume, the Spirit was ever entering into the hearts and minds of the “few” who were ready to respond to the call of the highest as they saw it, and bringing them to the divine Word, who gives meaning to every high endeavour, that through his creative activity theirs might be a growing understanding and a growing conscience. Moreover, the Spirit, the life-giver, could bestow on them the life which is the light of men: time and again, his progress may have been barred through the satisfaction of the many in earthly things, yet “in every age, entering into holy souls, He maketh them sons of

God and prophets" — that they might influence others. And throughout this long period of moral and spiritual development, men were being raised more and more to the realm of eternal values, where Israel could see eternal righteousness, and others eternal truth. The age-long prayer for "More light, more light" had yet to be granted; for "the whole of the Word"⁶ had yet to come in Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, theirs was the Word *ex parte*, and, as we see it now, that "partial influence of the Word" was at once creative and redemptive.

It may be that we can go even farther, and see the marks of this same inward and upward movement on the part of God as he carries out his design, and the same principle of working through the few to the many, in nature itself — though the suggestion comes only by way of analogy, and its verification lies in the field of scientific enquiry. The God of the world is "in" his world: he is "in" it, we would say, in the continuity of the whole evolutionary process, and in the direction it is taking. But in the light of the doctrine of the Unity in Trinity and Trinity in Unity, may it not be possible to be more specific, and to see in "the emergence of real difference" in the natural order, in the rise of fresh beginnings, the outcome of the "perfecting" activity of the Spirit, who "searcheth . . . the deep things of God", and in his driving power is

Boundless inward in the atom,
boundless outward in the whole?

And may it not be possible to see the activity of God the Word, "the unfolding of the divine thought",⁷ in what has been described as that "element of the unpredictable" inherent in the nature of things? — the "fresh beginnings" being, as it were, made subject to this creative activity, from which, in the process of adaptation of structure to function, the moving principle of life-giving cannot be separated.⁸ And over all is the will of the Father — the explanation of all things — that through this long process, this "travail of divine energy", as it has been called,⁹ the end shall at last be realized. But be this as it may, according to our faith the "unfulfilled intention", so evident in a nature groaning and travailing in pain, has its answer in those vistas of the fulness of life which Christ has opened to us by his resurrection and then by his ascension.

One of the Latin Fathers has a saying, which especially in these

days, we shall do well to take to heart: "In our wisdom we ought to worship, and in our worship we ought to be wise".¹⁰

Christianity, with its key-note of faith, impresses us as the rational religion which offers to man for his acceptance truth as a whole, that thereby the seeker after truth in one aspect of life may see the part in its relation to the whole. Scientist and historian, poet, artist, and philosopher—it takes these, and many more, to help us to comprehend life in its breadth and length and depth and height. But, we declare, as these are prepared to believe that they may understand (and to understand that they may believe the more worthily) they will come to know for themselves that "seeking they find, that wondering they reach the Kingdom, and that having reached the Kingdom, they find rest". For then will they confess not only that "the works of the Lord are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein", but also that the most stupendous of these "works", the Incarnation of the divine Word, gives meaning to the truths of man's natural as well as his spiritual environment. Henceforward, their particular quests become spiritual activities, as, illuminated by the Spirit, and brought to the Truth incarnate and through him to the Father of all, they are made partakers of the energies of the divine nature itself; and as they review their progress in an adventure calling for self-dedication in both heart and mind, they will agree that "before all things it is necessary to hold the Catholic Faith" if one is to be "safe".

And "in our worship we ought to be wise": ours should be no narrow view of God. For the God in whom we believe is eternally active, ever expressing himself through his "hands"¹¹—his Word and his Spirit—whether in this or in other worlds. But in this world his activity is expressed through beings who to some extent are able to understand his mind. These can picture the Creator rejoicing in all his works, both in their vastness and in their detail. In proper relationship to him and to their fellow-creatures they know that it is Eternal Love which "moves the sun and the other stars"; and when they enquire of all created things concerning Almighty God, they hear the united response, "He made me".

But more than this. They are convinced that divine condescension is bound up with the divine Majesty: that, at any rate so far as this world is concerned, God himself is afflicted in all the affliction of his creation, and that he creates and perfects only that he may redeem it from strife and struggle, and according to his will, bring

it to himself as a new creation, with man made in his image at its head.

We rejoice in our faith, and hold it out to a changing world as that which offers to man the true end of human longings and the ultimate answer to human enquiries. Its secret is the supreme revelation of God in Christ, and accordingly the worship of one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity.

¹ W. Temple, *The Nature of Religious Truth*, p. 167 (quoted by N. Micklem, *The Abyss of Truth*).

² Stephen Neill, *The Unfinished Task*, p. 194.

³ Gregory of Nyssa, *de Spiritu Sancto*.

⁴ Ibid., XVI. 37, 38.

⁵ Irenaeus, *adv. Haeres.*, III. 24. 1.

⁶ Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, II. 10.

⁷ Thomas Aquinas, *c. Gentes*, IV. 13.

⁸ I am here indebted to Dr C. E. Raven for his suggestions in his Gifford Lectures, *Science and Religion I*, pp. 191ff.

⁹ So C. A. Coulson, *Science and Christian Belief*, p. 109.

¹⁰ Lactantius, *Instit.*, IV. 3.

¹¹ Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, IV. Pref.

EDMUND GRINDAL AND THE NORTHERN PROVINCE

R. L. ARUNDALE

THIS article is an attempt to record and where possible to assess Grindal's work in the Northern Province, where he was Archbishop from 1571 to 1575.

Edmund Grindal was born in Cumberland, the son of a well-to-do farmer. He was educated at Cambridge, was proctor in 1549, and was elected Lady Margaret preacher for that year.¹ In this year the commission appointed by Edward VI held a visitation at Cambridge and the head of the commission, Nicholas Ridley, Bishop of Rochester, and late Master of Grindal's old college of Pembroke Hall, selected him to argue on the Protestant side in one of a series of disputations.² Parker later appointed Grindal as his chaplain, and in 1522 he became chaplain to the King.³

On the accession of Mary, Grindal left England and settled mostly at Strassburg where he attended the lectures of Peter Martyr. He appears to have been more attracted to Calvinism than Lutheranism, but probably the despotic attitude of Calvin repelled him from any desire to settle in Geneva. One of his chief employments during his exile was to collect the writings and stories of the sufferers in England, the results of which he communicated to John Foxe, who incorporated them into his *Acts and Monuments*.⁴ Many of the English exiles had settled at Frankfurt and unfortunately became involved in a bitter controversy. One party wished to use Edward VI's Second Prayer Book for public worship; the other, headed by Knox and Whittingham, "endeavoured to approximate the services to those of Geneva". The other English exiles attempted to act as mediators, and on two occasions Grindal was a member of deputations which visited Frankfurt with this object in view.⁵

Returning to England in 1559, Grindal at once took part in all the measures then adopted for the promotion of Protestantism, chief among which was the revision of the Prayer Book. He was appointed one of the commissioners for the revision of the liturgy, and when the Prayer Book was first introduced Grindal was selected as the preacher to explain it. In the conferences held at Westminster for the purpose of silencing the Roman Catholic divines, Grindal was one who ably championed the Protestant cause.⁶

In 1559 Grindal was consecrated Bishop of London. At first sight

it might appear to be a good choice, for he was a scholar, an opponent of Roman Catholicism, and a supporter of the Prayer Book, but his sympathy with the Puritan clergy made him an unsatisfactory instrument for carrying out the policy of Elizabeth and Archbishop Parker.⁷ The new bishop was in a difficult position, for London was the centre of Puritanism, which he as a supporter of the Crown, and yet a Puritan at heart, was expected to suppress, and his apparent vacillations made him an object of suspicion to both sides. Although he himself had protested against the use of copes, organs, chanting, bowing to the east, kneeling at Communion, and even the questions put to Godparents at the font, yet as bishop he would not only have to conform to these usages himself but compel others to do so.⁸ His correspondence with the continental reformers gives the clue to his attitude, for writing to Bullinger on 27 August 1566, he says:

We, who are now bishops, on our first return, and before we entered on our ministry, contended long and earnestly for the removal of those things that have occasioned the present dispute; but as we were unable to prevail, either with the queen or with parliament, we judged it best, after a consultation on the subject, not to desert our churches for the sake of a few ceremonies, and those not unlawful in themselves, especially as the pure doctrine of the gospel remained in all its integrity and freedom. . . . And we do not regret our resolution, the Lord giving the increase, our churches are enlarged and established, which under other circumstances would have become a prey to Ecebolians, Lutherans and semi-papists. . . .⁹

Writing again in 1567 to Henry Bullinger and Rudolph Gualter, Grindal complains of the attitude of some Puritans who contended that vestments were "impious, papistical, and idolatrous", and that all "pious persons ought . . . with one consent to retire from the ministry, than serve the church with these rags of popery. . . ." He contends that such people are ". . . disturbing the peace of the church and bringing the whole of our religion into danger." Whilst he was prepared to accept certain practices, such as the wearing of the surplice and the use of the sign of the cross, because he regarded them as "a matter of indifference", and although acquiescing, and even insisting upon their use, in order to retain his party in power, he would continue to advocate their abolition.¹⁰ He himself wore full episcopal dress at his consecration to the see of London, but afterwards refrained, when possible, from wearing it.¹¹

In 1570 Grindal became Archbishop of York, which see had been vacant since the death of Thomas Young in June 1568. Dr Hutton, the Dean of York, had written to Cecil recommending Grindal for the primacy. There was much need, he wrote, for an archbishop who must be

a teacher because the country is ignorant, vertuouse and godlie because the countrie is geven to sift a man's life, a stout and courageous man in God's cause because the countrie otherwise will abuse hym, and yet a sober and discret man, leaste to muche vigorousnes harden the hartes of some that by fayre means might be mollyfied—such a man as ys both learned hymselfe and also loveth learninge, that this rude and blynde countrie maye be furnished with learned preachers . . . ¹²

The Bishop of London, he added, was known to be "such a man". An excellent testimonial, but not a completely unbiassed one, for Matthew Hutton had been Grindal's chaplain and through that influence had received a prebend of St Paul's and the Mastership of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.¹³

Archbishop Parker's letter to Cecil speaks of a man whom he thought "fit for York, a heady and a stout people, witty and yet able to be dealt with by good governance as long as laws can be executed and men backed", but he also added that he ". . . was not resolute and severe enough for the government of London . . . since many of the ministers and people thereof, notwithstanding all his pains, still leaned to their former prejudices against all measures of reform . . ." ¹⁴

The new archbishop was not long in forming an opinion of his province, for although he only arrived on 17 August, by the 29th of the same month he was describing the people in a letter to Cecil in the following terms,

. . . I cannot yet write of the state of this country, as of mine own knowledge; but I am informed that the greatest part of our gentlemen are not well affected to godly religion, and that among the people there are many remnants of the old. They keep holy-days and fasts abrogated; they offer money, eggs etc., at the burial of their dead: they pray on beads etc: so as this seemeth to be, as it were another church, rather than a member of the rest. And for the little experience I have of these people, methinketh I see in them three evil qualities; which are great ignorance, much dulness to conceive better instructions, and great stiffness to retain their wonted errors. . . . —" ¹⁵

Grindal's chief influence would be felt through his visitations, and fortunately the Visitation Articles and Injunctions for his Primary Visitation of 1571,¹⁶ and also his Injunctions to the Archdeacons of York, Cleveland, East Riding, and Nottingham, and to the Bishop of Sodor and Man,¹⁷ are still extant.

There was, however, another weapon in the archbishop's hands: the Court of High Commission for the North, whose records have recently come to light. Little appears to have been published on their work, so that a slight digression at this stage can perhaps be forgiven. The Court was presided over by the archbishop, or his vicar-general, and, although aldermen of the City of York and Justices of the Peace were often members of the commission, they were rarely in court, and the business was carried on by the archbishop's officials, so that in effect the commission became an extra archiepiscopal court to which the archbishop often remitted cases because it had greater powers of punishment. As it was essentially a visitation court the commission adopted this type of procedure. First small commissions "in eyre" were set up, and later permanent local commissions with special juries who were to detect or receive information from any source about offenders which churchwardens or parishioners might have been supposed ready to conceal.¹⁸ The visiting commissioners often punished the offenders on the spot. Punishment usually began, in the case of recusants, with the accused entering into recognisances in a sum of money that he would attend church and communicate; or it took the form of a house arrest when the accused had to live in his own or someone else's house and confer with "learned ministers". A day was fixed for the offender to appear before the court, and if he still refused to conform he was sent to York Castle where there were various grades of cell from the comparatively comfortable to the extremely offensive. The offender was released if he would attend church, but refusal entailed imprisonment with greater discomfort, and in the most obstinate cases incarceration at Hull where conditions were really bad, and the prisoner was out of touch with his friends. We have an example of Grindal himself using this method, for in a letter to Lord Burleigh in November 1574 about the commission he says: "None of note were committed save only your old acquaintance, Dr. Vavasour, who hath been tolerated in his own house almost three quarters of a year." Apparently the doctor could not be convinced by argument about the error of his ways and Grindal

continues: “. . . My Lord President and I knowing his disposition to talk, thought it not good to commit the said Dr. Vavasour to the castle of York, where some other like affected remain prisoners; but rather to a solitary prison in the Queen’s majesty’s castle at Hull, where he shall only talk to walls.”¹⁹ The Commissioners then worked a “cat and mouse act”, for the culprit, after serving his sentence, was released for six months but could be returned to prison if he did not then conform.

We can see from Grindal’s Articles and Injunctions that his chief aims were the following.

The Suppression of Roman Catholicism

He enquires if any of the clergy favour Roman Catholicism (Article 19); if anyone defends or maintains any heresy, including Roman Catholics (Article 23); whether Mass is said (Article 24); if there are any Roman priests in the parish (Article 25); whether any books on the Roman Catholic faith are circulated (Article 41); and whether any one resorts to a priest for confession (Article 40).

Unfortunately the Visitation Books for the Primary Visitation of 1571 are not very informative on this matter, but Grindal, writing to Henry Bullinger on 25 January 1571, says,

. . . . I have laboured to the utmost of my power, and still continue to do, in the visitation of my Province and diocese, and in getting rid of these remaining superstitions which have maintained their place more firmly in this part of the country, suffering as it does under a dearth of learned and pious ministers. After the suppression of the late rebellion [Rebellion of the North] I find the people more complying than I had expected as far as external conformity is concerned; the reason is that they have been sufficiently distressed [*satis afflicti*], and therefore humbled by these calamities which are always the concomitants of civil war. I wish I had found them as well instructed in the true religion, as I left my flock in London and in Essex, to my successor. . . .²⁰

Sir Robert Gargrave made an independent survey and sent the “names of the principal gentlemen of Yorkshire” to Lord Burghley on 18 September 1572. He classified them as “43 Protestants; 19 of the ‘worst sort’ of Catholics; 22 ‘more or less evil’; 39 ‘doubtful’ ”.²¹

In 1574 Grindal writing to Burghley says,

We of the ecclesiastical commission here have sent a certificate to my lords of the council of our proceedings this term. Only five

persons have been committed for their obstinacy in papistical religion. For the number of that sect (thanks be to God!) daily diminisheth, in this diocese especially.²²

Rather more information is available for the visitation of 1575, but once again the number of recusants is low and there is a lack of organization or consolidation into large groups. Almost every one of those towns and villages which in later visitations show big recusant followings remains in 1575 free or virtually free from recusancy, a fact which it is difficult to explain away by any contention that the return may be incomplete.²³ The only doubtful exception is at Scarborough, where 33 men are presented "for cominge slowlie to the churche, morninge praier, beinge halfe doone, and have bene demaunded their fynes and refuse to paie the same".²⁴ The returns are incomplete, for there are no entries for the Diocese of Chester, or the Archdeaconry of Nottingham, but the totals are 14 recusants and 30 non-communicants, from 510 parishes.²⁵ Not all the recusants or non-communicants need necessarily have been Roman Catholics, but it is likely that the vast majority were, because Puritanism had not yet led many people to break with the Church.

It is difficult to draw firm conclusions from the foregoing evidence, for some Roman Catholics would not be cited, such as those who worshipped in private chapels, or left the parish, so that insufficient evidence against them was available. Similarly, powerful country gentlemen and their families where there was no neighbouring Protestant rival escape presentation. Nevertheless it is difficult to believe that many cases would escape detection by vicar and churchwardens or the jurymen of the High Commission.²⁶ One is led to the conclusion that active recusancy was not a pressing problem in the Northern Province in the time of Archbishop Grindal; indeed Roman Catholicism was probably at its lowest ebb of the reign of Elizabeth, for subsequent visitations show a marked rise in the number with an estimated 3,500 recusants in 1604.²⁷

The Abolition of "Romish" Practices within the Church

Grindal enquires if stone altars have been destroyed (Article 4); whether any mass books and other Romish books remain, if all vestments, crosses, candle-sticks, images, and indeed all the adjuncts of Roman worship have been destroyed (Article 6); whether the clergy continue to wear a cope, to use a chalice, or to use any

"gesture" not appointed by the Book of Common Prayer, or any "Popish" ceremonies in Baptism (Article 7); whether any feast or fast days not in the "New Kalendar" of the Prayer Book are still observed (Article 8); whether bells are illegally tolled at funerals, saints days, or on other occasions (Article 8); whether illegal processions were held (Article 38).

The Visitation of 1575 gives much evidence of illegal practices but far fewer than Archbishop Young's visitation of 1567-8. In the visitation of 1567-8 the district of Holderness appeared to have almost totally disregarded the Queen's Injunctions, e.g. the parsons of Easington, Owthorpe, Sproatley, Beeford, and Frodingham, all continued to use the communion (i.e. Mass) for the dead.²⁸ At Skeffling "a holie water stock, an image with a crosse that the roode hanged on is reserved, an alter yet standing, the pulpit undecentlie kept, no collection for the poor, no chest for the registre book".²⁹ Compared with the above, almost the only case of this nature from Holderness in 1575 is that of Richard Halome, parish clerk of Swine, who "is presented to be a defender and mainteyner of the Romishe religion and saieth it will never from his hart".³⁰

There is little doubt from the evidence available in the visitation records that many of the outstanding records of the old religion had been swept away, largely through the efforts of Archbishop Grindal, but one might pause to consider why the change had taken so long. No doubt there were many who were deeply attached to the "old religion" and resented any change; but the scattered nature of the parishes and the lack of educated clergy to give a lead simply meant that changes were not made because of apathy and ignorance. The distinction too "between actual recusancy and mere religious conservatism must be carefully made. The later included many shades of opinion and practice, ranging from vague and passive sympathy with prescribed rites and doctrines to active and treasonable support."³¹ Thus there probably was much overt opposition by Catholic sympathizers to any changes in vestments, ornaments, and ceremonies.

Professor Dickens makes the statement that "most Elizabethan ecclesiastical courts exerted but slight reformatory influences upon either church or people".³² This would, at first sight appear to be incorrect in the case of Holderness, for the work of Grindal appears to have eradicated most Popish forms and ceremonies from the churches. Unfortunately it is but an example of the fact that the

work of the ecclesiastical courts was punitive rather than reformatory for the number of recusants in Holderness which was nil in 1575 and 1578, jumps to 18 in 1590;³³ and 39 in 1604.³⁴

An attempt to obtain a sufficiently educated Clergy and Laity

Common Prayer to be sung or said . . . *distinctly and reverently*. (Article 1); whether a Quarterly sermon is preached (Article 10); if some part of the Homilies is read when there is no sermon (Article 12); whether clergy neglect their studies (Article 18); whether catechizing took place (Article 13); whether parents and masters sent their children and apprentices (Article 14).

Dr Purvis tells us that "no record of any examination or of any course of instruction prescribed before Ordination has been found in the Elizabethan registers nor any document referring to a standard of proficiency in religious knowledge required of the clergy". but there are entries in Grindal's Act Book of Institutions which reveal an established practice:

Item ye shall daylie reade at least one chapter of the oulde Testament and another of the New with good advisement, and suche of you as be under the degree of a maister of arte shall provide and have of your owne accordinge to the quenes majesties injunctions at leaste the newe Testament both in latine and englishe, conferinge the one with the other everye daye one chapter thereof at the leaste, so that upon the examination of the Archdeacon commissary or their officers in synodes and visitations or at other appointed tymes it maye appeare, how ye profite in the studie of holye scripture.

However only nine out of 195 clergy instituted were so examined,³⁵ but a definite attempt was made to examine the clergy by the Domestic Chaplains of the Archbishops going on special visitation in areas roughly equivalent to the Rural Deaneries. Although not bearing out the statement that the Tudor clergy were completely illiterate there is evidence that the standard of education could be much improved. A striking instance of the poor education of some of the clergy is seen in the following example: William Ireland being examined by the Archbishop's Domestic Chaplain as to his knowledge of Latin translated *vestri humiles obedientes* as "your humbleness and obedience". His reply to the question, "Who brought up the people of Israel out of Egypt?" was "King Saul". Being asked who was first circumcised, he made no reply.³⁶ An assessment of the Tudor clergy is often made from the few extreme cases which are quoted from time to

time, but the real facts may be that though the standard of education was low, the majority of the clergy were by no means illiterate and were attending conscientiously to their duties. Both the Visitation and High Commission records bear testimony to the fact that action was taken if a parson was found to be educationally unsuitable.

It must be remembered that a special licence was required to preach, even though only four sermons a year were required in each parish. Where the incumbent was unlicensed he must read from the book of Homilies and no gloss or commentary of any kind was allowed. He was also required to procure "or to persuade his Rector or Rector's farmer to procure a licenced preacher to deliver at least one sermon in each quarter of the year". No figures are available for the number of licences issued during Grindal's episcopate, but Dr Purvis gives the figure for the twenty-one years from 1606 to 1627 as 245, some of which were for a restricted area only, and states "there is no reason to suppose that the number issued during the whole reign of Elizabeth was not so large as this". We have, however, the evidence of Grindal himself when in his famous letter of 1576 defending the "Propheesyings" or Exercises, he makes the following statement:

I, for mine own part . . . am very careful in allowing such preachers only, as be able and sufficient to be preachers, both for their knowledge in the scriptures, and also for testimony of their good life and conversation . . . we [the bishops] admit no man to office, that either professeth papistry or puritanism. Generally, the graduates of the university are only admitted to be preachers, unless it be some few which have excellent gifts of knowledge in the scriptures, joined with good utterance and godly persuasion. I myself procured about forty learned preachers and graduates, within less than six years, to be placed within the diocese of York, besides those I found there; and there I have left them. . . .³⁷

Far out-numbering all other charges concerning the conduct of the services is that alleging that the required quarterly sermons were not preached. In the great majority of these cases, the fault lay either with the rector, or the farmer, in the former case usually because he was a pluralist. In 1575, out of the deplorable total of 142, eight only are stated to be due to pluralists, sixteen to negligence by the rector, eleven to negligence by the farmer, six parishes were too poor to have sermons (preachers' fees are not mentioned,

but evidently existed and were high), and two parishes were vacant; of all the rest, no details are given.³⁸

There is no matter to which all the records under consideration [Tudor] show closer and more consistent attention than that of teaching of the Catechism; it was evidently regarded as an element in religious education for which there was absolutely no possible substitute. . . . Special attention should be given to the fact that the Catechism was not only a standard body of instruction to be given to the young; it was also regularly and extensively used as a test of religious knowledge and even religious conformity; it was used to guard the Sacraments of the Church against unqualified persons. Both clergy and laity, according to their respective duties, were subject to a constant and scrupulous examination in their knowledge and use of the Catechism.³⁹

Evidence of this full use of the Catechism is to be seen in Grindal's Injunctions for a body of teaching, namely, "the ten commandments, the articles of the beleife, the Lordes prayer in Englishe . . . and the catechism sette forth in the Booke of Common Prayer", is ordered to be taught to the children and servants (Article 5), and similar tests are to be used for those who wish to communicate; those over twenty-four years of age must know by heart ". . . at leaste the ten commandments, the articles of the faithe and the Lordes Prayer in Englishe", and for those between fourteen and twenty four years of age the test was the catechism (Article 7). Furthermore, warning of the date of the Communion must be given, prior notice must be given by the intending communicant, and only those able to pass the above test were to be allowed to communicate (Article 8). The same test was to be applied before marriage, or even before the publication of the banns (Article 9), and even to godparents at Baptism (Article 10). Injunctions 10 and 11 for the laity repeat the substance of Injunctions 7 and 8 for the clergy.⁴⁰

It is evident from the above that Grindal was trying to obtain an educated clergy and laity; that he was not more successful is due to a variety of factors; the poverty and isolation of many of the clergy which meant that they had little access to books, the ease with which some bishops would ordain, and in the case of many of the graduates the fact that their poverty had meant that their passage through the university had been as "servitors", when their opportunities for sustained study were limited.

How far the Catechism was systematically taught is a little difficult to say, but the majority of parishes appear to be satisfactory and some of the teaching no doubt took place in the schools which were growing up. One word of warning is required to anyone who makes a study of the teaching of the Catechism. As the years pass the growth of Puritanism led to many people refusing to send their children to be catechized; in fact this becomes an indication of Puritan recusancy, e.g. "John Wadsworth and Phebe, his wife, for not sending their children and servants to be catechised".⁴¹ (The Wadsworths were a noted Puritan family in Horbury, in the West Riding of Yorkshire.)

An insistence on the use of the Prayer Book and on church attendance

Grindal inquired: Whether Common Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion were said "distinctly and reverently" and at the proper times (Article 1); whether there were available "all things necessary and requisite for Common Prayer and the administration of the Sacraments" including the requisite books and a "comely and decent table" and a "decent large surplice with sleeves" (Article 2); if the Communion Service was read at the appropriate times (Article 3); if sermons were preached and homilies read (Articles 10 and 12); if any "preach, declare or speak anything" in derogation of the Book of Common Prayer (Article 20); whether the people attended church regularly and behaved in an orderly manner (Article 43); whether the "Twelve Penny Fine" is levied for absenteeism (Article 44); whether anyone has left the church during the service, or disturbed the minister, or resorted to any other church (Article 45).⁴²

Grindal had seen the chaotic conditions earlier in the reign when many of the returned exiles had fought strenuously against the use of vestments, and against other practices which they regarded as Popish;⁴³ indeed a document dated 14th February 1564-5 which describes conditions in the London diocese is usually attributed to him.⁴⁴ There is no doubt that these Injunctions would displease the followers of the "old religion" on the one hand and the extreme Puritans on the other, but, as we have seen, Grindal was determined to eradicate Roman Catholicism, and as yet, Puritanism had not become a potent force in the North.

The question of attendance at church does not appear to be very

serious in 1575, except at Scarborough, where 33 men are charged for coming late to Morning Prayer, 15 for absence at Evening Prayer "during the tyme whereof they were shootinge", 5 for "plaieing cards in evennyng praier time", and 6 who were absent from Evening Prayer for reasons unstated.⁴⁵

Several people were presented for following secular occupations like the "people upon the Pavement [York] [who] do commonlie open their shoppes on Sondaies and holiedaies if faires and marketts fall on such daies";⁴⁶ for drinking, like "Robte. Sedgewicke (who) keepeth evell companie in his howse tiplinge in service tyme";⁴⁷ or for playing games, usually bowls, like Robert Fulbarn of Dighton who "misused the Curate beinge but willed by him to leave of the unlawful game of bowlinge in the churche yearde . . . which Roberte did before hurt the Curate with his dagger and was never punished".⁴⁸

There were also cases of absence from church for fear of being arrested, especially for debt, as in the case of George Layton of Garforth who "cometh not to Churche. It is thought to rather be for fear of processe than for mislikinge of religion."⁴⁹

The numbers presented for non-attendance were much less than those in later years, but this is no proof that attendance was good. It may be that clergy and churchwardens hesitated to present non-attenders, except recusants, either because of indolence or because they themselves had failed to inflict the statutory fine.

Grindal was also concerned in his Visitations with a variety of other matters, such as moral delinquency, the duties of patrons, churchwardens, and parish clerks, the question of plurality, marriages, and a variety of other subjects. The foregoing have been chosen to illustrate, so far as possible, his personal influence upon the province and to assess in some measure its lasting effect.

There is little doubt that Grindal's Puritanism left its mark on the province, but this must not be over-estimated. The vast majority of the Elizabethan bishops were of that school, and whoever had been translated to York would have followed the same course of action, although probably with less tact than Grindal.

His opposition to Roman Catholicism had little real effect, for it grew rapidly after this period, due largely to the work of the seminary priests and Jesuits.⁵⁰

In his "interpretation" of the Prayer Book, Grindal probably had more lasting influence, for his work was continued by his two

immediate successors. In this "interpretation" Grindal never commanded anything which was not covered either by the Prayer Book Rubrics themselves, the Elizabethan Injunctions, or Parker's Injunctions of 1564-5, e.g. he only commanded that a church must possess a surplice and no mention is made of other vestments, but Parker's Injunctions say that, except in collegiate and cathedral churches, the minister "shall wear a comely surplice". There was no doubt much grumbling at the new austerity, which was not Elizabeth's real intention, but there could be no alternative, for the Roman Catholic opposition, if not silenced, had been driven from the Anglican Church, and the real influence which was arising in the North was that of Puritanism.

One other aspect of his Puritanism is to be seen in the Injunctions asking "whether there be any innkeepers etc who permit persons in their houses to eat, drink, or play at cards" etc in service time, or shopkeepers who keep open during service time (Article 46),⁵¹ or whether "the ministers and churchwardens have suffered any Lords of Misrule, or Summer lords or ladies, or any disguised persons, or others, in Christmas, or at May-games, or any Morris dancers, . . . to come unreverently into the church or churchyard and there to dance, or play any unseemly parts with scoffs, jests, wanton gestures, or ribald talk, namely in the time of Common Prayer", etc. (Article 61).⁵²

These Injunctions cut at the very roots of the traditional English Sunday, when after Divine Service games and merriment were the order of the day. No doubt there had been grave abuses; churchyards, and even churches, had been desecrated, people had drunk too much, and certain ceremonies had encouraged immorality; but it must be remembered that for generations the churchyard or the church had been the centre for many innocent pleasures. In stopping abuse the Archbishop removed many of the pleasures of the ordinary folk. An outstanding example which took place in 1576, shortly after Grindal's translation to Canterbury, was a decision by the High Commission concerning the Wakefield Miracle, or Corpus Christi Plays, which were some of the most famous in England. The Commission made so many conditions that the plays were probably ruined.⁵³ Grumbling at this change in the English Sunday must have been rife, but once again there could be no organized opposition.

Grindal's laudable efforts to obtain an educated clergy were very

slow to bear fruit; but his encouragement of "Propheysings or Exercises" did much to raise a knowledgeable Puritan party in Yorkshire, and this was probably his most lasting work although barely started when he left the diocese. These Propheysings were so called from 1 Corinthians 14, "Follow after charity, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy . . . He that prophesieth speaketh—to edification, and exhortation, and comfort—Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the church".⁵⁴ All over the Midlands and East Anglia parishes and groups of parishes were holding meetings for prayer, study, and exposition of the Bible.⁵⁵ At Northampton, in 1571, the system had the approval of the diocesan bishop, Edmund Scambler, of the Mayor, and "other of the Queen's Majesty's Justices of the Peace within the county and town".⁵⁶ Meetings for "Propheysings" were held on Saturday mornings—at first once a fortnight; afterwards every week—the ministers of the town and neighbourhood taking part in them. The first speaker expounded a passage of scripture which had been chosen at the previous meeting, and he was allowed forty-five minutes. The second and third speakers were allowed a quarter of an hour each, and the "moderator" then closed the discussion. Prayers were also offered, and the whole "service", which was held in one of the churches, lasted two hours. Anyone who wished could be present.

That there were grave dangers in the scheme could be seen at Northampton, for there moderate Puritans were "rapidly constructing a theory of church order very different from that set up by Crown and Prayer Book, and were trying how much it could be carried into practice within the restraints imposed by law". In every church in the town the organ was silenced, there were services on Tuesdays and Thursdays for Bible readings, and in the principal church there was a sermon every Sunday; Morning Prayer in the other churches concluded by 9.0 a.m. so that people could attend to hear it. Young people were examined for an hour each Sunday in Calvin's Catechism. A house-to-house visitation was held before each quarterly Communion to examine all who should attend. Strangest of all was a committee consisting of the mayor, and members of the corporation, together with the clergy and certain laity appointed by the bishop, which met each Thursday as a court of discipline to reprove or punish persons who were guilty

of such crimes as non-attendance at Communion, drunkenness, profanity, etc.

The "Propheesyings" were very popular, but could be extremely dangerous, for although laymen were not supposed to speak they sometimes joined in, and the meeting could become unruly. Condemnation of Rome could easily become criticism of episcopacy and established Anglican practice, particularly when, as sometimes happened, extreme Puritans who had been silenced for their non-conformity attended the meetings and joined in the discussions.⁵⁷

Some bishops, including those of Norwich, Lincoln, London, Winchester, Bath, Lichfield, Gloucester, Chichester, Exeter, and St Davids, and Grindal himself, approved of the "Propheesyings" but felt that safeguards were required. Grindal was translated to Canterbury and in 1576 was ordered by the Queen to suppress the meetings. Upon his refusal he was suspended from all episcopal functions. His letter to the Queen in reply to her command, admirably expresses both the safeguards imposed by the bishops and their reasons for allowing the meetings to continue:

These orders following are also observed in the said exercise: First, two or three of the gravest and best learned pastors are appointed of the Bishop to moderate in every assembly. No man may speak unless he be first allowed by the Bishop, with this proviso, that no layman be suffered to speak at any time. No controversy of this present time and state shall be moved or dealt withal. If any attempt the contrary, he is put to silence by the moderator. None is suffered to glance openly or covertly at persons public or private, neither yet anyone to confute another. If any man utter a wrong sense of the Scripture, he is privately admonished thereof and better instructed by the moderator or other of his fellow ministers. If any man use immodest speech, or irreverend gesture or behaviour or otherwise be suspected in life, he is likewise admonished as before. If any man do willfully break these orders, he is presented to the Bishop to be by him corrected. . . .

The advantages of the "Propheesyings", Grindal enumerates as:

1. The Ministers of the Church are more skilful and ready in the Scriptures, and apter to teach their flocks.
2. It withdraweth them from idleness, wandering, gaming etc.
3. Some afore suspected in doctrine are brought hereby to open confession of the truth.
4. Ignorant ministers are driven to study, if not for conscience sake yet for shame and fear of discipline.
5. The opinion of laymen touching the idleness of the clergy is hereby removed. . . . and

although some few have abused this good and necessary exercise, there is no reason that the malice of a few should prejudice all. . . .⁵⁸

Grindal had already earlier in 1576 issued "orders for reformation of abuses about the learned exercises and conferences among the ministers of the church" and these are couched in similar terms to his letter to Elizabeth.⁵⁹

All this was very laudable, but savoured somewhat of "locking the stable door", in view of events at Northampton and elsewhere.

These events took place after Grindal left York, but there is no doubt that "Propheisyings" were taking place at Halifax, and probably at Manchester and other places, during his archbishopric, and in some districts they even became known as "Grindalizings".⁶⁰ Grindal himself in his letter to Elizabeth mentions the meetings in Halifax:

What bred rebellion in the North? Was it not papistry, and ignorance of God's word, through want of often preaching? And in the time of that rebellion [Rebellion of the North], were not all men, of all states, that made profession of the gospel, most ready to offer their lives for your defence? Insomuch that one poor parish in Yorkshire, which by continual preaching had been better instructed than the rest, (Halifax, I mean) was ready to bring three or four thousand able men into the field to serve you against the said rebels . . .⁶¹

These Halifax Exercises (Propheisyings) encouraged by Grindal had a profound effect upon a growth of Puritanism in the North. They were discontinued after Elizabeth's warning, but revived under James I and grew rapidly under Dr Favour, the Vicar of Halifax. Permanent preachers were appointed, and many visiting preachers are recorded, including the vicars of Leeds, Huddersfield, Wakefield, and Pudsey, all centres of Puritanism.⁶² At a later stage (c. 1626) a library was founded by the vicar, Robert Clay, although the church possessed a nucleus of books prior to this date. In 1651 the library possessed about 60 volumes. The "Fathers" such as St Ambrose and St Augustine accounted for about one third of the books, there were four books on Roman Law, the classics are represented by Cicero and Horace, "commentaries" by St Thomas Aquinas and Nicholas de Lyra, and a "small host" of sixteenth and seventeenth century divines such as Erasmus, Bucer, Musculus, Beza, Greenham, Chytraeus, William Perkins, Francis White, Dr Hall, and John Diodate.⁶³

Of Grindal's Puritanism there can be no doubt, but he was not an extremist, and was indeed prepared to deal strictly with those who would not conform to the Prayer Book. Had he not become Archbishop of York, Puritanism would still have spread, but may easily have become the extreme type which arose in other parts of England. His attack on Roman Catholicism was ineffective so far as its devout followers were concerned, but he did continue and consolidate the work of Archbishop Young in sweeping away what he regarded as "Popish" ornaments, vestments, and practices from the Church.

His attempt to obtain an educated clergy and laity was not rapidly to bear fruit, but there is little doubt that its real success, if viewed from a Puritan standpoint, was his encouragement of the "Prophesyings". As the result of the training received there came a group of Puritans whose opposition was fortified by training and knowledge and who were to have a profound effect upon the history of the West Riding of Yorkshire and upon non-conformity as a whole.

¹ *Dictionary of National Biography*, Ed. 1890, 23, p. 261.

² *Ibid. Remains of Edmund Grindal*, Parker Society, Cambridge 1843, pp. 193 ff. W. F. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*. New Series V, pp. 9-11. G. Townend, *Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, London 1849, VI, p. 322.

³ *D.N.B.*, p. 261. Hook, pp. 12-13.

⁴ *Remains*, pp. iii; 219-238.

⁵ *D.N.B.*, p. 261-2. Hook, pp. 17-24. J. Collier, *Ecclesiastical History*, London 1807, Vol. VI, pp. 144-152. *Zürich Letters*, 2 Vols, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1845, *passim*.

⁶ *D.N.B.*, p. 262. Hook, pp. 35-42. J. Strype, *Edmund Grindal*, Oxford 1821, pp. 22-41. E. Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, Oxford 1840, pp. 56-92.

⁷ *D.N.B.*, p. 262.

⁸ F. O. White Skeffington, *Lives of Elizabethan Bishops*, 1898, p. 64.

⁹ *Zurich*. I, p. 169.

¹⁰ *Zurich*. I, pp. 176-7.

¹¹ Hook, p. 42.

¹² Col. S. P. Dom. Eliz. Vol. XLVIII, No. 41. Nov. 13, 1568. J. Strype, *Annals*, Vol. II, pp. 262-3.

¹³ White, p. 69.

¹⁴ Landsdowne. MSS XI. 57. Jan 3 (1569). White, p. 69. Hook, p. 75.

¹⁵ *Remains*, pp. 325-6. Sharp, pp. 76-7. Strype, *Grindal*, p. 243. White, p. 69. P.R.O., S. P. Dom. Eliz. LXXIII, No. 35.

¹⁶ W. H. Frere, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*. Alcuin Club. XVI. Longman Green 1910, pp. 253-93. Second Ritual Report. Appendix E. pp. 407-15.

¹⁷ Frere, pp. 294-5. *Remains*, p. 123. York Dio. Reg. Grindal Register, f. 123 and f. 124.

¹⁸ J. S. Purvis, *Tudor Parish Documents of the Diocese of York*, Cambridge University Press, p. 36.

¹⁹ *Remains*, pp. 350-1.

²⁰ Birt, p. 326. *Zurich*. I. pp. 258-60.

- ⁴¹ Birt, p. 327. S. P. Dom. Add. Eliz. XXI 86ii.
- ²² *Remains*, p. 350. Birt, p. 330.
- ²³ A. G. Dickens, "Romanist Recusancy in Yorkshire 1560-1590", *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*. Vol. XXV, 1941, p. 166
- ²⁴ York Dio. Registry. R. VI. A.5. f. 86. N.B. The York Diocesan Registry MSS are now to be found at the Boothwick Institute of Historical Research, St Anthony's Hall, York.
- ²⁵ Purvis, p. 79. ²⁶ Dickens, p. 159.
- ²⁷ A. G. Dickens and I. Newton, Further Light on the Scope of Yorkshire Recusancy in 1604. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*. Vol. XXXVIII, Pt. 152, 1955, pp. 524-8.
- ²⁸ Dickens, p. 161. York Dio. Reg., R. VI. A. 23. fos. 187, 188v, 194v, 206, 207.
- ²⁹ Dickens, p. 161. ³⁰ Dickens, p. 167. York Dio. Reg. R. VI, A.5. fo.71.
- ³¹ Dickens, p. 157. ³² Dickens, p. 158. ³³ Dickens, p. 182.
- ³⁴ A. G. Dickens, The Extent and Character of Recusancy in Yorkshire 1604, p. 30. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*. Vol. XXXVII, Pt. 145, 1948.
- ³⁵ Purvis, p. 98. Frere, p. 280. York Dio. Reg. Reg. Grindal. No. 22. fo. 156v.
- ³⁶ Purvis, pp. 101, 109-35.
- ³⁷ *Remains*, p. 380. ³⁸ Purvis, pp. 133-4. ³⁹ Purvis, p. 128.
- ⁴⁰ Purvis, pp. 128-30. Frere, pp. 275-8. Ritual Report, pp. 411-12.
- ⁴¹ York Dio. Reg., R. VI A. 33.
- ⁴² Frere, pp. 253-5: 257: 260: 266-7. Ritual Report, pp. 407-10
- ⁴³ Ed. W. K. Lowther Clarke, *Liturgy and Worship*, S.P.C.K. 1932, pp. 184-5.
- ⁴⁴ B. M. Lansdowne MSS., 8. f. 16.
- ⁴⁵ Purvis, pp. 77-8. ⁴⁶ Purvis, p. 91.
- ⁴⁷ York Dio. Reg., Visitation Books. R. VI. A. 5., f. 3v.
- ⁴⁸ Purvis, p. 92.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid. p. 93. York Dio. Reg., Visitation Books. R.VI. A.5., f. 13v.
- ⁵⁰ Dickens, p. 179. ⁵¹ Frere, p. 267. Ritual Report, p. 410.
- ⁵² Frere, p. 271. Ritual Report, p. 411.
- ⁵³ Purvis, p. 173 ff. Eccl. Comm. R.VII. A.9., f. 20.
- ⁵⁴ J. R. Tanner, *Tudor Constitutional Documents*, Cambridge 1930. p. 179.
- ⁵⁵ P. Hughes, *The Reformation in England*, Hollis and Carter 1954, III, p. 182.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 183.
- ⁵⁷ R. W. Dale, *History of English Congregationalism*, Hodder & Stoughton, pp. 101-4.
- ⁵⁸ Tanner, pp. 182-4. Strype II. Appendix IX.
- ⁵⁹ *Remains*, pp. 373-4. Cotton. MS. Cleopatra. F. 11. p. 261.
- ⁶⁰ J. G. Miall, *Congregationalism in Yorkshire*, Snow 1868, pp. 12-13.
- ⁶¹ *Remains*, p. 380.
- ⁶² T. W. Hanson, *Halifax Exercises*. Transactions of the Halifax Antiquarian Society, 1913. pp. 303-321.
- ⁶³ T. W. Hanson, *Halifax Parish Church Library*. Transactions of the Halifax Antiquarian Society, 1909, pp. 291 ff; 1951, pp. 37-45.

THE BEHMENISTS

W. H. G. ARMYTAGE

I

"A CHRISTIAN has", wrote Jacob Boehme, "no sect; he may live among sects, and also attend their divine services, but yet not belong to any sect; he has only one science—Christ in him." Boehme envisaged a seventh state in the history of the world when contention between human beings would cease, "the branches would no longer believe they were themselves trees, but rejoice in their common root". He looked forward, not as much to a millenium on earth, but to the restoration of this seventh state by the "principle of light" becoming paramount and dissipating the external world. This paramouncy demands decision on the part of man; if he sets his mind to it, he will adhere to it when the last judgement is made, and become an angel. If he sets his mind against it, he will become a devil, for ever and ever.¹

The theosophy of Jacob Boehme, a self-taught shoemaker of Görlitz, had an extraordinary vogue in seventeenth-century England. It was manifest in 1644—twenty years after his death—when a brief seven-page biography of him was published, describing his knowledge of "Natural and Divine things" as "the most wonderful deep knowledge" that "any hath been known to do since the Apostles' times". It broke upon the abrasive sectarian warfare of the times like a revelation in itself. Apostles of Behmenism appeared, notably the Hotham brothers, Charles and Durand, sons of the great parliamentary soldier who had served in Germany under Elector Palatine and Mansfield, refused Charles I admission to Hull, and captured Scarborough for the Parliament, only to be arrested in 1645 and executed for making overtures to Royalists. Charles Hotham (the third son) was at that time a fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge, where he made a name as a chemist and "searcher into the secrets of nature". Six years later, Charles Hotham was deprived of his Fellowship by Parliament and went to Wigan as rector. Whilst there he translated and published Boehme's *Consolatory Treatise of the Four Complexions* (1654). In the same year his younger brother, Durand, also interested in science, published a life of Boehme "to stir up the more searching Spirits to a thorough weighing of all that he hath published".²

These "searching spirits" were already forthcoming. John Sparrow, a lawyer, and his kinsman, John Ellistone, undertook the complete translation of Boehme's works during the years 1647 to 1662.

Another, much affected by Boehme, was Sir Henry Vane, whose mysticism led him to be distrusted by all parties even though he was the most assiduous servant of the Commonwealth in high office. One of his disciples, George Sikes, in *A Short Narrative of the Main Passage of his Earthly Pilgrimage* (1662) wrote after his death:

He was a partaker of the Divine Nature (2 Pet. 1. 4.), 'tis past the skill of human nature to interpret him . . . He hath the *New Name*, which no man knowes but he that hath it.

Bishop Burnet wrote in his history (Vol. 1, p. 285) of Vane and his party, the "Seekers":

in these meetings he preached and prayed often himself, but with so peculiar a darkness, that though I have sometimes taken pains to find out the meaning of his works yet I could never reach it. . . . His friends told me that he leaned to Origen's notion of a universal salvation of all.

Considering the political impact of this belief, Dr Willcock remarks: "It was the result of his [Vane's] recognition of the rule of Christ in the natural conscience in the elemental reason, in virtue of which man is properly a law to himself" that the idea of natural right and government by consent was first stated.³

2

Others besides the Hothams and Vane had "the new name". In 1654, there had existed a Behmenist community in Bradfield for seven years under a person whom Richard Baxter regarded as "Chieftest of the Behmenists", John Pordage. Elias Ashmole had given Pordage the living of Bradfield in 1647, where he had set up a kind of community, members of which "lived in the highest spiritual state". Pordage was "Father Abraham" and his wife "Deborah". Baxter thought they tried to carry the "perfection of monastical life too far". They "lived together in community", he wrote, "and pretend to hold visible and sensible communion with the angels".⁴

Pordage, though he simplified and coarsened Boehme's teaching, grasped its essentials and describes himself as receiving in August

1649 "not only a clear leading convicting light upon our understandings, but likewise received from the Lord a stamp and strong impression of power moving our wills to follow the light through the death of all things, to come up into the perfect life and image of God".⁵ To him flocked disciples: Thomas Bromley and Edmund Brice, both fellows of All Souls College, Oxford, and Philip Herbert, Earl of Pembroke. As with most disciples, Lord Pembroke took his master's teachings too literally. For, according to one account, he came early to King Charles II's bedside in April 1665 and:

kneeling told his Majesty that he had a great message to deliver to him, and that was, the end of the world would be this year, and therefore desired his Majesty to prepare for it. "Well," says the king, "if it be so, yet notwithstanding I will give you seven years' purchase for your manor of Wilton" at which he replied "No, an please your Majesty, it shall die with me" and so went away, making his Majesty and the whole Court merry with this fancy. And now I am mentioning Quakers, (continued the correspondent) here is daily several Barges full of them sent down the river Thames to be transported into Foreign plantations.⁶

But before that Pordage had been ejected from the living on the twofold ground of blasphemy and immorality: blasphemy in view of the "revelations" he had received, immorality in having had improper intercourse with a woman in London. This was in 1654. Pordage's reply was the pamphlet *Innocence appearing through the Dark Mists of Pretended Guilt*, which in turn provoked a pamphlet from one of his judges in which Pordage was compared to Satan at Noon. Three other members of the community cast fitful gleams in the dark gloom of provincial puritanism. One of them, Ebenezer Coppe, was an anabaptist whose "Fiery Flying Roll" was burnt by order of Parliament in 1650. Another, Robert Everard, ultimately became a Roman Catholic. A third, Thomas Tany, had already served a term in Newgate prison, proclaiming the rebuilding of the Temple and himself as the high priest, and disappeared after assaulting men at the Parliament House.

3

The restoration of Charles II did little to mitigate Pordage's hardships. In 1663 he had a small congregation in London where he was joined by Mrs Leade, a thirty-nine-year-old mother of four

daughters, two of whom had died in infancy. From her account, Dr Pordage's group now numbered about a hundred. The plague in 1665 drove them to Bradfield, where Mrs Pordage died in 1668. Dr Pordage and Thomas Bromley then returned to London. Mrs Leade's husband died in 1670, leaving her poverty stricken, as the man to whom her husband had entrusted his money proved a swindler. Mrs Leade, after a deep study of Boehme's writings, experienced "visions". These in 1670 she recorded in a spiritual diary entitled *A Fountain of Gardens*. In 1673 or thereabouts Pordage and Mrs Leade agreed "to wait together in prayer and pure dedication". As a result there followed a book by Mrs Leade entitled *The Heavenly Cloud Now Breaking* (1681).

Mrs Leade was the practical spirit, Dr Pordage the speculative. Whereas he was a mild chiliast, she became a strict one. To her the real advent of Christ, the resurrection and transfiguration of all believers, and the establishment of the glorified Church on earth was envisioned. "Now as to the time when," she later wrote in *The Wars of David* (1700), "it is not to be put as a day afar off, but the time is present, and is already begun in some, that are known and Register'd in the Heaven, and shall from a little number to a full body increase." After Pordage's death in 1681, she used his tracts (which he never published during his lifetime) to supplement her own.

The Behmenist ground-swell had been growing. It was strong enough to elicit from John Anderdon in 1662 *One Blow at Babel in those of the Pepole called Behmenites, whose foundation is not upon that of the Prophets and Apostles, which shall stand sure and firm for ever; but upon their own Carnal Conceptions, begotten in their Imaginations upon Jacob Behmen's writings*. It also inspired John Milton, pupil of the millenarian Mede and friend of the Andrian Hartlib, in *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*. An American, Dr Bailey, has argued that these bear striking affinities to Behmenist thought. *Paradise Regained*, as she sees it, is the story of the heaven within men, not so much the place where dreams come true as a state in which man is the measure of all things in heaven and earth. *Paradise Lost* pictures Utopia, in a certain sense; not the ideal society to which man is progressing, it is true, but the ideal state from which he came and which he has the power to revive within himself if he but will. "The belief of Milton's time in the expected millenium", she wrote, "had kept the idea of paradise ever

before men's minds, until regaining paradise was the most natural thought in the world to them."⁷

Mrs Leade's *Revelation of Revelations* (1683) attracted a great deal of attention in Germany and, together with its predecessor, was translated into German. There she became so well known that when some German settlers under Kelpius (another Behmenist) were emigrating to Pennsylvania in the steps of F. D. Pastorius, leaving the old world behind them for Germantown in America, they visited Mrs Leade to exchange millennial convictions. This was early in 1694, when Mrs Leade was seventy-one years old. It also attracted a young English doctor from Leyden, Francis Lee, who found her living at Lady Mico's College, a house of charity near London.

4

Francis Lee was thirty-four at the time of his first acquaintance with Mrs Leade in 1694. A former fellow of St John's College, Oxford, he had refused to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary and, after acting as a private tutor, had travelled abroad, where he had taken his degree in medicine. He has left us an account of how he was asked by a Rotterdam merchant called Finley to visit her to get "a transcript of her writings". He did so and the result was that he joined forces with her. Mrs Leade's foreign correspondents were increasing in number; and soon after they met she became blind, so he undertook to write letters from her dictation and dispatch them. As a result, the next three years were marked by an intensive number of publications on her part. *The Enochian Walks with God* (1694); *The Laws of Paradise* (1695); *The Wonders of God's Creation, Manifested in the Variety of Eight Worlds* (1695). In the intervals of transcription Lee found time to marry Mrs Leade's daughter.

The result of this increased activity was that a group of disciples began to gather round them. First they met in a house purchased for them by Baron Knyphausen, then at the house of Joanna Openbridge in Baldwin's Gardens, then at Hungerford Gardens and finally at Westmorland House. They called themselves the Philadelphian Society. In 1696 Mrs Leade dictated *A Message to them Withersoever Dispersed over the Whole Earth* followed by *The Tree of Faith: or, The Tree of Life, springing upon the Paradise of God* (1696), *The Ark of Faith* (1696), and *A Revelation of the Everlasting Gospel Message* (1697).

5

The Philadelphians now obtained a fresh convert in Dr Richard Roach, a schoolfellow of Dr Lee, who moved in physically and psychically. Not only did he live with them, but he partook of their visions and was "visited from above with extraordinary communication". He published, with Lee, a monthly periodical for the society consisting of "Memoirs, Conference, Letters, Dissertations, Inquiries etc. For the Advancement of Piety and Divine Philosophy" entitled *Theosophical Transactions*.

These certainly stimulated interest. The Archbishop of Canterbury was prevailed upon to see Roach but found him "rooted in his opinions". Roach was vicar of St Augustine's, Hackney, and a Fellow of St John's College, Oxford, and his college were worried about his behaviour. So were others. At Hungerford Gardens "great opposition and violence from the rude multitude" prevented their public meetings, and they adjourned to Westmorland House where they drew up "constitutions" and also an explanation of the proceedings, to serve as an answer to the many inquiries they were receiving. As a "new sect with a hard name" they were often confused with Quakers, so they pointed out:

As to their difference . . . they were not so silly as to place Religion in Thouing and Theeing, in keeping on their Hats, or in a sad Countenance, as the Hypocrites had in our Saviour's time . . . As to their peculiar Principles [they held] That the Coming of Christ was near at Hand; and therefore they think it their Duty to warn and awaken the World, that they may prepare for that great and solemn Time, by a good Life, Universal Charity, and Union among the Protestant Churches.⁸

Mrs Leade was unusually prolific. Six more tracts between 1697 and 1701 included her three volume diary *A Fountain of Gardens*. In this year (1697) a constitution for the Philadelphian Society was laid down. With German money, the Philadelphians could keep Mrs Leade in full communion with the spirit world, and in 1699 she obliged with *The Sign of the Times, Forerunning the Kingdom of Christ and Evidencing what is to come*. Another physician, Lot Fisher, also joined the Philadelphian group.

Lee was concerned with the practical aspects of the Old Testament story. One of his tracts *On Naval Architecture, as Applied to Noah's Ark, showing how it was Accommodated to Live in a Tempest of Waters*. Perhaps he felt himself at sin in view of his

eighty-year-old mother-in-law's increasing senility, for the Philadelphians broke up in 1703.⁷

Lee's piety and energy had one good practical effect. It is generally believed that he suggested to Robert Nelson, F.R.S. (his friend, whose life he was commissioned to write but did not), the foundation of Charity Schools.¹⁰ That pattern was to become almost endemic amongst the mystics: if the new dispensation was not to be vouchsafed for their generation, it should be made possible for the next. Education was the invariable concomitant of Utopist endeavour.

Lee was characteristic of them, a scientific yet credulous figure, enmeshed by the symbolism and analogism of nature and religion. He read so much oriental literature that his nickname was "Rabbi Lee".

Lee became a Roman Catholic just before his death in 1719, but his old schoolfellow Roach lived on to spread the millenarian gospel. In *The Great Crisis, or the Mystery of the Times and Seasons Unfolded* (1725) and *The Imperial Standard of Messiah Triumphant Coming now in the Power and Kingdom of His Father to reign with the Saints on Earth* (1728) Roach continued Mrs Leade's work.

Another chiliast who was attracted by the Philadelphian Society was Thomas Beverley who in a dozen or so pamphlets forecast the millenium for the year 1697. Roach, in his *Imperial Standard Advanced*, records the change of mind induced in him.

Mr. B. desir'd, and had a conference with the Society; in which they speaking of the Kingdom first in Spirit, and Inward Power; and not expecting the great things which he did, at that Time, and so nothing being found to Answer His Scheme of Things, he concluded Overhastily against this Own Line of Time and Alter'd it to 1700.

The Germans (who took Mrs Leade far more seriously than the English) numbered Beverley amongst the Philadelphians and translated one of his works. Certainly the *Theosophical Transactions* contained an account of a New Christ said to have been born at Gutenberg in Bayreuth and even had a representative in Germany in the person of young Johann Dittmar. For German literalism corrupted the mystical teaching of Pordage and Mrs Leade, and one of the most disreputable of its exponents was Eva von Buttlar who with two adherents professed to be a representative of the Trinity. She preached complete community of goods and unlimited

sexual intercourse for her followers, and at her trial in 1706 alleged that a writing of Pordage lay at the root of her ideas.

6

The great impulses which the Philadelphians transmitted were the creed of simpler living, and it is here that the pragmatic view of the mystics finds justification. Mysticism demands a kind of asceticism, and by a singular chance this doctrine was assimilated by George Cheyne, M.D., a Falstaffian figure, thirty years old and thirty-one stones in weight, who had come to London in 1701, lording it in taverns, eating and drinking till his bulk excited the comment of those with whom he rioted. Part of his personal therapy was a course of Bath waters, part of a regimen of abstemiousness. But, finding that appetite returned, and with it increasing corpulence, he became, by personal experience, a believer in vegetarianism. At the age of forty-nine he published *Observations concerning the Nature and due Method of Treating the Gout* (1720). In this he spoke his mind: most of the English disorders, he said, began in immoderate diet, lack of proper exercise among the upper classes, and an uncertain climate, which closed the pores, making normal perspiration impossible. Cheyne had begun to capitalize his own experiences later to be graphically compiled in *The English Malady* (1733). Between his *Observations on the Gout* (1720) and *Essay on Health and long Life* (1724), he literally practised his temperance and vegetarian theories on himself. The result was highly successful, and for the remaining nineteen years of his life (he died in 1742 at the age of 72), he was an enthusiastic apostle of food reform. He was also a successful one, for his *Essay on Health* ran to nine editions in thirty years, and was being published over a hundred years later. It was much cited by John Wesley, who used it extensively when compiling his own *Primitive Physic* in 1764.¹¹

Cheyne introduced the works of Boehme to his great friend William Law,¹² in whom the movement found its greatest mouth-piece. Law was so interested in Lee that he borrowed from Lee's daughter, Mrs de la Fontaine, many of her father's manuscripts and copied several of them by his own hand. These he kept with him at King's Cliffe, a farm near Stamford where he retired in 1740 with Mrs Hutcheson and Miss Hester Gibbon, the historian's aunt. Law was the great idealist and mystic of the early eighteenth century.

When another graduate of Leyden, Bernard Mandeville, a contemporary of Lee's wrote the great analysis of eighteenth-century society known as *The Fable of the Bees*, or *Private Vices Public Benefits* (1714), showing that human beings are essentially depraved, and pouring scorn on the charity schools founded by the S.P.C.K. Law refuted it in print. Mandeville's thesis, so fundamentally opposed to that of the millenarians, as indeed of all men who believed in revelation of any kind, needed refutation, and Law's was so successful that it was republished by F. D. Maurice in 1846.

Law's philosophy was contained in his *Serious Call*, a book which exercised a great influence over John Wesley who, though he quarrelled with him, acknowledged "Mr. Law . . . was once a kind of oracle to me".¹³ "Law came before the Gospel", said another of his "pupils".¹⁴

Law channelled Behmenist thought into the main current of English mysticism, and by his detailed work in the study at King's Cliffe after 1740, made it "safe" to study. But the chiliastic element in it kept emerging to disconcert contemporaries and their successors.

One of the reasons why Law never married was revealed by himself just before he went to King's Cliffe.

John the Baptist came out of the Wilderness burning and shining, to preach the Kingdom of Heaven at hand. Look at this great saint, all ye that desire to preach the Gospel. Now if this holy Baptist, when he came to Jerusalem and had preached a while upon penitence, and the Kingdom of Heaven at hand, had made an offering of his Heart to some fine young *Lady of great accomplishments*, had not this put an end to all that burning shining in his character?

For the next twenty-one years he and his two female companions tried to carry out the precepts of his *Serious Call*.

The strength of a virus can also be measured by the reaction of its antibodies, and the Behmenian virus was no exception. Bishop Warburton said of Boehme's writings that "they would disgrace even Bedlam at pale moon". John Wesley called him a "demonosopher". Dr Johnson regretted that Boehme had uttered his visions. Gibbon found them "incomprehensible". Southey referred to the "nonsense of the German Shoemaker" and Hallam regarded it as "the incoherencies of madness". But Coleridge found in Boehme great inspiration and the copy of Law's edition which he used, with

the copious marginal notes which he made in August 1818, can still be seen by the curious in the British Museum.¹⁵

¹ Nils Thune, *The Behmenists and Philadelphians* (Upsala, 1948) gives an excellent account of the whole movement.

² For the probable influence exercised by Durand Hotham on Fox see R. M. Jones, *Spiritual Reformers* (London, 1912), p. 212; and for the possible influence of Boehme on Gerrard Winstanley see R. M. Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London, 1909), p. 495.

³ John Locke, who was to give this doctrine philosophic form, was secretary to Sir Walter Vane (Henry's brother) and went with him to Brandenburg in 1664, two years after Sir Henry's execution. A copy of Sir Henry's *Retired Man's Meditations* (1665), owned by John Locke, contained a scrap of paper with a list of Boehme's works for sale (*Notes and Queries*, II S.V. (1912) p. 66).

See also John Willcock, *Life of Sir Henry Vane the Younger* (London 1913), pp. 254, 258, 350, 357.

⁴ *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (1696), p. 387, § 285.

⁵ *Innocence Appearing through the Dark Mists of Pretended Guilt* (1655), p. 78.

⁶ Hist. MSS. Comm. (Hastings) II (1930), p. 150.

⁷ M. L. Bailey, *Milton and Boehme* (O.U.P., 1914), p. 141.

⁸ Some of his papers are in the Bodleian Library (MS. Rawlinson).

⁹ An account of Lee and Mrs Leade can be found in *Notes and Materials for a biography of William Law* (1854) together with his correspondence with Henry Dodwell (pp. 188-258).

¹⁰ "He was the first that put Mr. Hoare and Mr. Nelson upon the founding of Charity Schools, upon the same plan as that of Halle in Germany, and was continually encouraging and promoting all manner of Charities." F. Secretan, *Life of the Pious Robert Nelson* (1866), p. 70.

¹¹ For a good study of Cheyne see C. A. Moore, *Backgrounds of English Literature, 1700-1760* (Minneapolis, 1953).

¹² J. H. Overton, *William Law* (London, 1881), p. 92.

¹³ For the relationship between them see C. W. Towlson, *Moravian and Methodist* (1957), pp. 14-16.

¹⁴ Venn, *Family Annals*, p. 72.

¹⁵ *The Works of Jacob Behmen. . . . to which is prefixed the life of the Philosopher left by the Rev. Wm. Law* (J. Richardson, 1764). Press Mark C.126. K.1. Coleridge's main comments can be seen in Vol. 1, pp. 125-7.

THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CONSCIENCE IN POST-WAR GERMANY

P. J. CHANDLER

EVANGELICAL Christians in Germany are among the first to deplore the absence of a vital social conscience in earlier generations of their fellow-Churchmen. One reason for the comparative passivity of Christians under the Nazi régime was the Lutheran tradition of submission to the State and an unwillingness to meddle in social and political matters. In some parts of Germany, notably in the south-west, this tradition had been reinforced during the eighteenth century by the influence of pietism.

After the travail of the years from 1933 to 1945, the Church in Germany has mercifully been given another chance to come into the main stream of the people's lives. The upheaval of war, and now the completely new situation of post-war West Germany, have presented both problems and opportunities to the Church. The indications are that Church leaders—and not least the laymen—are eager to seize the chance now offered them.

The Church in Germany has inherited some admirable Christian social agencies from the last century. Take, for instance, the Deaconess Houses and the work of the deaconesses in general. These are typical Lutheran institutions, and are to be found, for example, in Sweden as well. The work of the deaconesses in the parishes is medical, pastoral, and educational, in that order of importance. The training of a deaconess, in the "mother-house", lasts approximately two-and-a-half years. Two years of this time are spent in hospital and general nursing training, the remaining six months in specifically Christian and pastoral preparation. In the parishes, the deaconesses can work in the hospitals or act rather like district nurses, or do purely parochial duties; in each case, they work in close conjunction with the clergy of the parish, though not under their control. The deaconesses have countless opportunities for pastoral and evangelistic contacts which are denied to even the most zealous clergyman, and they should provide an admirable example of the social influence and outreach of the Christian Church.

If devotion and enthusiasm were sufficient for evangelism, the deaconess system would provide it admirably. One can only be humbled by the efficiency and piety of the deaconesses and clergy

in charge of the mother-houses. One such mother-house in Stuttgart was completely destroyed during the war, and has now risen again from the devastation, complete with the most modern equipment and amenities. In addition to training the young deaconesses, this house provides a home for elderly members who have retired from their active ministry. The chapel of the house, furnished in modern style, and still housing a pre-war mural painting which was rescued by novices from the war-time *mêlée*, is one of the few Evangelical places of worship to provide daily services.

The whole institution comes under the aegis of the officials of the Church by means of the "Interior Mission" of the Evangelical Church. It has the veneration and affection of countless members of the Church. But an onlooker may be pardoned for questioning whether its methods are flexible enough to meet the revolutionary situation of post-war Germany. Its very age and venerability may here hamper it in the unprecedented situation of to-day. Happily, there are other organizations which have recently grown up side by side with the deaconess houses to tackle the new problems.

Before turning to consider them, however, there is another aspect of nineteenth-century Christian social activity which may first be mentioned. At Reutlingen, between Tübingen and Stuttgart, can be found the headquarters of the Gustav Werner Institution. It began from the Christian social conscience of the parish priest whose name it bears. In some ways comparable with the contemporary Church Army and similar agencies in England, the Institution has developed from the humble beginnings of giving a helping hand to a few needy children to a great and beneficent organization for providing virtually a welfare State in miniature. It now includes a residential school for backward children, a hostel for youths who are starting their first employment away from home (amongst them are some young refugees from the East), a small hostel for youngsters who need supervision after being in trouble with the police, and a home for old people. It also maintains a well-known paper factory, which is used as a training ground for large numbers of apprentices, and is equipped with very modern plant and amenities. This is one of a network of similar factories in various parts of southern Germany. Thanks to the initial purpose of Gustav Werner and his successors, a Christian atmosphere pervades the whole Institution, and makes it not only a training ground, but home, to its hundreds of members. In such ways, Christianity has

been brought to bear on social and individual problems for two or three generations. These, however, are ways of dealing with continuing problems. We turn now to see some ways in which the Church in West Germany is coping, and coping very well, with the special situation which has arisen since the second World War.

The organization which is known as *Hilfswerk* is among the most important of these. It is an official agency of the Church, and as such it represents the Church in its dealings with the State on the whole question of the refugees, as well as giving the practical help that is needed. The work began shortly after the war to meet the urgent needs of the countless refugees from countries further east; but in recent years the flow of refugees from those countries has diminished and the State has taken over the responsibility of handling them. Since 1951, however, there has come the new problem of helping those who come out of East Germany into West Germany, the Federal Republic.

The needs of these fellow-Germans are both moral and material. On the purely physical side, they have no accommodation, no money, and no work when they arrive in West Germany. *Hilfswerk* attempts to provide all three, and set them up in a way which will enable them to maintain themselves thereafter. It is easy to say this; but the problems of putting it into effect on the huge scale involved have been and still are stupendous. They are being tackled with an energy and enthusiasm which are highly creditable to the Church. At the same time, officials from *Hilfswerk* are quick to give credit to the various State departments with which they work in close harmony.

The other half of the problem concerns the mental rehabilitation of these refugees. For many of them, coming into West Germany means that they have to start the process of thinking for themselves for the first time for years. In the case of young men, they have never known the process at all, for they have grown up in the mental strait-jackets first of Nazism, then of Communism. Under these régimes, thinking was dangerous. They now have to begin to learn to be responsible for themselves. Their training begins with some elements of democratic decision and control in the camps; but it must lead on to involve total decisions on their future work and way of life.

If the problems are difficult when *Hilfswerk* and other organizations are dealing with able-bodied young bachelors, how much more

intractable are the difficulties which confront any organization which tries to rehabilitate whole families! Yet these, too, must be handled by the Church's workers. Permanent homes are at least as hard to come by in West Germany as in other western countries, and in many cases families which have had no settled home for years may not be in a fit condition to settle down at once in modern residential accommodation. Therefore, experiments have been made with a sort of "half-way house" between the main camps for refugees and the ideal of the single dwelling for each family. Such short-term homes provide privacy and some individual responsibility for each family, but are only intended as a temporary arrangement until the families are ready for permanent homes—and permanent homes are ready for them. When at last all the refugees have been properly housed, the short-term homes, it is planned, can be used for other social needs.

It goes without saying that the Church in West Germany is very much alive to the need for providing homes and training for orphans, those separated from their families, and people incapacitated from normal work. Equally, Christians in West Germany are eager to do all that is in their power to help their fellow-Christians across the frontier in East Germany. Their work is made harder by the policy of the Communist East German government in allowing only individuals, not organizations, to send food parcels and the like into the country.

Let us turn now to the relations between the Evangelical Church on the one hand and the State and industry on the other. Lutheran Churches had a long tradition of subservience to the State; but in the immediate post-war years, Churchmen tried to take a very active part in German politics. The results, according to German Christians of to-day, were not too happy. Every political problem was raised to the level of a matter of conscience; those who disagreed with the political outlook of their own Church were made to appear, *ipso facto*, as bad Christians. Further experience and reflection have brought a maturer political judgement to bear, and now the Church is more concerned to permeate political and social thinking through indirect means rather than by direct participation.

One of the most hopeful developments in this connection is the Evangelical Academy at Bad Boll. The die-hards of the Church were not interested in creating a Christian social and industrial consciousness, so some Christians who felt the urgent need to permeate the

trade unions, works councils, and the like, with Christian people and Christian thinking set up this college as a meeting place and training ground for the dissemination of their ideas. It is fortunate to be in delightful countryside in Württemberg, within sight of the Suabian Alps, where anyone would be pleased to spend a few days of recreation and study.

Institutions which may be compared with the Bad Boll Academy are the Moor Park Adult Educational College at Farnham, Surrey, or the Sigtuna Foundation in Sweden. (It is significant that residential Christian adult colleges are coming into existence in different countries, to meet similar needs, at one and the same time.) The aims of Bad Boll, and of the fifteen other similar colleges in other Evangelical Churches of Germany, are to make contact with workers, teachers, and young people, with the idea of helping each group to find out the right attitude to adopt to their own life and work. Thus, for example, conferences can be held between management and workers, with Christian members of the staff helping each side to come to mutual understanding. Or again, meetings and conferences are held to try to find ways of bridging the gulf between the Church and the unevangelized workers. From such conferences have come demands for liturgical reform within the Evangelical Church (whose normal services are too intellectual and make very little appeal to the masses) and for pastoral experiments, such as the holding of house meetings, in the individual parishes.

All this work receives due recognition from the Church as such. The Church authorities in Württemberg provided the buildings for the college, made three ministers available for its work, and contribute a quarter of its running costs. (Another quarter, significantly enough, comes from the State; the remainder must be paid by the students or their sponsors). New buildings, to house a much larger number of students, are under construction. The new part will include, for the first time, a chapel. Anglicans may well raise their eyebrows when they hear of a Christian college which at present feels no urgent need for a permanent chapel.

The good work at Bad Boll itself is spread further afield by the monthly paper *The Open Word*. The title, like the whole aim of the college and its paper, combines traditional Evangelical theology with a readiness to face and penetrate new situations. The Church in West Germany as a whole is alive to the value of the printed

word to supplement its preaching and social witness. There is, for example, a mobile library which visits and evangelizes outlying districts. Inexpensive books of Christian teaching are being widely circulated. And an attempt has been started at Stuttgart to bring Christian teaching and criticism to bear on the cinemas and the films they show.

The total picture, of which this article is necessarily only a partial glimpse, is of a Church newly awakening to its social responsibilities and eagerly feeling its way to producing a Christian social conscience and witness. Its task is to combine traditional Evangelical theology with modern social and individual technique, and not the least significant feature is the present willingness of the Church in West Germany to look beyond the Lutheran community to seek enlightenment and encouragement from other Christian traditions as well.

NUMEN, NIRVANA, AND THE DEFINITION OF RELIGION

NINIAN SMART

DESPITE Rudolf Otto's remarkable contributions to the philosophy and comparative study of religion, there is a defect in his treatment of spiritual experience—namely, his relative neglect of, and partial misinterpretation of, Buddhist nirvana.¹ This hinders a fully satisfactory analysis of mysticism and militates against a correct description of the nature of religion. What I wish to show here is, briefly, as follows. Given Otto's analysis of his own illuminating expression "numinous", nirvana is not, strictly speaking, numinous; but nirvana is the key concept of (at least Lesser Vehicle) Buddhist doctrine and practice; hence it is unsatisfactory to define religion by reference to the numinous or analogous notions. Further, however, by appeal to the idea of "family resemblance", we can avoid the embarrassment we might feel at not discovering some essence of all religion. Finally I attempt to indicate how a sharp differentiation between agnostic mysticism and theism (together with pantheism and other forms of characteristically numinous religion) can lead to new insights into the structure of religious doctrine and experience.

I

Let us first examine one of Otto's rare and scattered remarks about nirvana:

It exercises a "fascination" by which its votaries are as much carried away as are the Hindu or the Christian by the corresponding objects of their worship.²

It is surely clear that the use of the expression "votaries" and the implication contained in the phrase "corresponding objects of worship" accord nirvana a status it never possessed in Theravāda Buddhism and almost certainly did not explicitly possess in the earliest form of the religion.³ Gods and god-like entities can have votaries and be objects of worship: but the serenity of nirvana is no god, nor is it even the peace of God. It is interesting to note that Otto writes, in his foreword to *Mysticism East and West*, that we must combat the

erroneous assumption that mysticism is "one and ever the same". Only thus is it possible to comprehend such great spiritual phenomena

as, for instance, the German Meister Eckhart, the Indian Śāṅkara, the Greek Plotinus, the mystics of the Buddhist Mahāyāna school, in all their characteristic individuality, instead of allowing them to disappear into the shadowy night of "general mysticism". The nature of mysticism only becomes clear in the fullness of its possible manifestations.⁴

The Hīnayāna is left out, even though it has produced such a striking handbook of mystical meditation as the *Visuddhimagga* and despite the accounts of the Buddha's Enlightenment. Further, Hīnayāna mysticism exhibits a greater divagation from theistic mysticism than does even the soul-mysticism of Yoga and Jainism.

Before listing rather briefly a few reasons for denying that nirvana, is, in the strict sense, numinous, it is perhaps as well to counter the criticism of unfairness: "Surely we owe the term 'numinous' to Otto, and if he uses it of nirvana, are we not to say that he knows best?" But once a term is introduced it becomes public property: I am not arguing against the use of "numinous", for Otto's coining has been of great service—it is only that on certain occasions he is loose or inconsistent in his employment of it.

(i) The elements in the numinous discrimination by Otto are, it will be recalled, those of awefulness, overpoweringness, energy, and "fascination". Now these certainly depict admirably objects of worship, such as gods and God. To some extent also they define many ghostly and "spooky" phenomena which Otto uses as examples. But a state such as nirvana hardly possesses all these characteristics: only, perhaps, "fascination". Now it may be replied that each of the elements should be regarded rather as a *mark*; i.e., each by itself tends to or would establish the numinousness of whatever possesses it. But apart from the undesirable looseness that this interpretation would confer upon the term, Otto analysed the numinous in the way that he did because all the elements are usually or always found in genuine objects of worship.

(ii) Experiences cannot easily be understood in isolation, but are best seen in their whole setting—in the attitude and behaviour which surround them; in particular, religious experience must be viewed in the context of the spiritual practices associated with it or expressing it. Thus characteristically experiences of awe, of an overpowering and energetic presence, are associated with and expressed by such activities as worship and sacrifice. Now altogether it is true that the mystical Path towards some inner realization as we find it in

the Christian setting is integrated with activities such as the worship of and prayer to a personal God, in the Lesser Vehicle there is not merely formal agnosticism, but the religion of sacrifice and worship associated with a divine Being or beings is ignored as being irrelevant to salvation. Moreover, such attention as is paid to numinous entities such as *nats* and *devas* is merely peripheral, springing from non-Buddhist sources; while the veneration of relics such as the Sacred Tooth is moderated severely by the denial of Gotama's divinity.⁵

(iii) Otto, in criticizing the subjectivism of Schleiermacher's account of creature-feeling, remarked: "The numinous . . . is felt as objective and outside the self."⁶ This indeed is a correct description of how a *numen praesens* strikes the religious man; note that not merely is the *numen* in some way "objective", but there is even a dualism continually being expressed in religious language between the worshipper and the object of awe. But nirvana could hardly be counted a *numen praesens*; and it is only in a rather peculiar sense "outside the self". Admittedly we here run into complications, on account both of the fact that in certain spiritual contexts there is the notion of a Self set over against the "empirical self" and of the peculiarly Buddhist *anattā* (non-self) doctrine. But first, the *numen praesens* is usually thought of as nearby in some spatial or quasi-spatial way. And second, even those who would interpret nirvana as a kind of beatified persistence beyond death⁷ not unlike Christian immortality (though without God there) give an account inconsistent with nirvana's being conceived as an object of worship. Also, whatever may be said—and quite a lot can be—in defence of the notion of mystical experience as "other" than ordinary experience (thus generating the concept of an "other" Self, etc., realizable through mystical endeavour, as in some of the *Upaniṣads*), quite clearly there is a difference between the sense in which the Ātman is "beyond" the empirical self and that in which God is "beyond" the visible world and so is that mysterious Other. The difference is indicated by that tension which we find in theistic mysticism and which was well expressed by Rabindranath Tagore when he said: "What we want is to worship God. But if the worshipper and the Object of Worship are on, how can there be any worship?" Nevertheless, despite the difference, it is the genius of certain religions to fuse together different insights into a single doctrinal scheme—so that, e.g., realizing the Ātman is becoming Brahman and that the cloud of unknowing is the dwelling-place of that God who appeared

in a very different sort of cloud to Job: this commingling of strands of religious language, experience, and practice (for the three go together) will be further considered below.

(iv) Nirvana, however, is given certain epithets which might lead one to think of it as something like Ultimate Reality – and this in turn is sometimes an impersonal way of describing God.⁸ And hence we get such statements as this:

Nirvana . . . is not stated in such a way that it can be identified with God, but it may be said to be feeling after an expression of the same truth.⁹

Thus nirvana is called “deathless” (*amata*), “unconditioned” (*asankhata*), “permanent” (*nicca, dhuvā*), etc. Now even if these epithets may be held to assimilate nirvana in some degree, though certainly in a loose manner, to God, they reveal themselves upon inspection to be typically applicable to a mystical state in this life just as much as to a genuinely transcendent Being. Thus nirvana is *amatā* because it is (to quote another epithet) *akutobhaya*, “with nothing to fear from anywhere”, for in attaining it in this life one loses the fear of death – and not merely because of the doctrine that there will then be no rebirth hereafter,¹⁰ but through the great peacefulness and serenity of it. And also it is *amata* because the mystical experience at its highest level is, in being without perceptions, likewise without time.¹¹ Again, it is permanent partly at least by contrast with the world of compound things, which are transitory and fleeting: for though early Buddhism denied the soul of *ātman*, the distinction between the spiritual state and the world of ordinary experience is, naturally enough, retained. Similarly with “unconditioned”.¹² And nirvana transcends the impermanent world by being, so to speak, other-worldly – an otherworldliness defined by the training laid down in the Noble Eightfold Path, and because it is *yogakkhema anuttara*, “unsurpassed peace”, of transcendent value. That is to say, then, the epithets are understandably applicable even to nirvana in this existence,¹³ without our bringing in that final nirvana accruing upon death and negatively expressed by saying that there is no rebirth.

(v) Otto elsewhere says:

The salvation sought in Nirvana, like that sought in Yoga, is magical and numinous. It is the utterly suprarational, of which only silence

can speak. It is a blessedness which fascinates. It is only to be achieved by way of negation—the inexpressible wonder.¹⁴

Here, to put it briefly, Otto's main ground for declaring nirvana to be numinous is that it is utterly non-rational. But that a thing is non-rational does not entail that it is numinous, though the converse may perhaps hold. Otto elsewhere gives an account of what he means by "non-rational": while on the one hand we may experience deep joy, which on introspection can be "identified in precise conceptual terms", it is otherwise with religious "bliss": not even the most concentrated attention can elucidate the object to which it refers—it is purely a felt experience, only to be indicated symbolically.¹⁵ But it is perhaps odd to say that in all non-religious contexts we can if pressed express our feelings "in precise conceptual terms". Nevertheless, there are certainly occasions upon which we can say *why* we are overjoyed, etc., and this clearly has something to do with "the object to which the state of mind refers". This understanding, however, is impossible with regard to a genuine mystical state for a different reason from that which makes it impossible with regard to a feeling of "bliss" at the fascination of the numinous. For a feeling of supreme exaltation in the context of worship or worshipping meditation is connected with God: for God is that at which, so to speak, attention is directed; and God is mysterious and overwhelming and so not to be described adequately. On the other hand, in agnostic mysticism (and we find analogies in all mysticism) the state of mind is quite empty and rapt and there is in the nature of the case nothing "to which the state of mind refers". A different sort of "non-rationality" is connected with reaction to the holy from that association with mystical liberation, though the two become fused in religions such as Brahmanism and Christianity. A second and most important point here that there is some danger in overemphasising the "non-rational" character of such spiritual experiences. This can be illustrated from the fact that Otto, in discussing the difference between agnostic soul-mysticism (such as agnostic Yoga) and the Brahman-mysticism exemplified in Śāṅkara, remarks that the difference between their contents is itself non-rational and only to be comprehended in mystical experience itself.¹⁶ This despairing statement hardly does justice to Otto's own achievement in discriminating the two types; but it is connected with his belief that religious concepts are merely symbolical. The danger in regarding doctrines and religious terminology as "only

symbols" is that they can easily this way become distorted, by being viewed as somehow pointing to the same Reality. And to say this last thing is to utter at best a half-truth. For we must distinguish between (a) describing one religious view in terms of another, (b) describing it in its own terms, and (c) exhibiting analogies. Now as for (a), a Christian or a Hindu might wish to say that the two religions are, in certain of their doctrines, pointing to the same truth; but because each would prefer or insist on using one set of symbols rather than another to depict this truth, they would in effect be interpreting the other religion in terms of their own. Similarly we may, as apologists, interpret nirvana in theistic terms, but this is emphatically not what the Buddha said, and to treat nirvana in Hīnayāna terms we have to retain the agnosticism. As to (c), it is certainly illuminating to trace the respects in which attaining nirvana may be like attaining the unitive life of Western mysticism: it is doubtless on such analogies that an interpretation of nirvana in a loosely theistic sense would have to be based. The differences too are important: but Otto in his extreme emphasis on non-rationality is in difficulty over characterizing them.

(vi) Finally, with regard to the interpretation of final nirvana as a transcendent state "beyond space and time", this indeed is a vexed and complicated subject. But even if we grant that the Buddha's negations leave room for the belief that there is some kind of entity persisting in a non-empirical state after death, the nearest model we have for picturing such a condition is the sheer tranquility of the yogic mystic in his highest self-realization; and the points that have been made above about the pure mystical state as not *necessarily* having anything to do with the numinous will hold again in this context.

Briefly, then: although Otto's analysis of the numinous fits very well gods and god-like entities and well describes men's reactions to these in experience—although, that is, it is successful in regard to those beings who are typically addressed in worship and negotiated with in sacrifice—it hardly holds in regard to those states and entities that are encountered along the yogic path. But this point is sometimes obscured because, in the circle of theistic religion (and this is what we are most accustomed to in the West), it is common to associate the beatific nirvana-like state with God; nevertheless, though it may in fact be true that the mystical vision is vision of the numinous Deity, it is not *self-evident*, it is not analyt-

ically true. We must recognize the possibility of mysticism without worship, just as all along we have recognized the phrases of religious history where there is worship, prayer, and sacrifice without any yogic or mystical path; but there is no genuine concept of god or God without worship, and conversely. The importance of nirvana is that it is a purer example of the mystical goal even than the soul-mysticism of Yoga that Otto studied, for in Buddhism there is not even the *ātman*, and it is perhaps a sign of the Buddha's rigid determination to evolve a "pure" mysticism without any theistic or pantheistic complications that he excluded the concept of an eternal soul, which in being capable of separate existence and in being described substantivally is already too much adaptable to numinous concepts—as both the Vedānta and theistic Yoga demonstrate.

2

The question arises here as to how we are to define "religion" in such a way that the term will cover not only polytheism and theism (i.e. religions which are suffused with numinousness), together with not too dissimilar pantheistic faiths, but also agnostic and transtheistic Buddhism and Jainism. Of course the problem has exercised many before now, and for this or similar reasons Buddhism has often been regarded as a "crux" in the comparative study of religion. One way of trying to produce an old-fashioned definition is to point to some "essence" of religious phenomena; but a result of this is to distort the agnostic faiths by interpreting their negations as a type of theological agnosticism, so as to have an essential content in all religions. Another way is to place heavy emphasis on some essential spirit in all religions, such as their numinosity. In this way religions will have a common form; but again this is to distort, since for instance, the numinous aspects of popular Buddhism in the Hīnayāna are merely peripheral—it is not *nats* and spirits that makes it a living faith, but the call to nirvana. Again, one may try to avoid these pit-falls by escape into empty generality, as with Tillich's definition in terms of "man's ultimate concern"¹⁷—to give *this* content it is necessary to define these terms themselves, which leads back to a definition of the first type; and here we are in even subtler danger of interpreting another faith in terms, albeit vague, of one's own. But all this is unnecessary, once we abandon the old-fashioned notion of definition and throw

off the fascination of essences. It is a commonplace in contemporary analytic philosophy that many general words apply to a wide variety of things in virtue, not of some common property, but of "family resemblance", and so are not capable of an essentialist definition.¹⁸ To give a crude scheme of family resemblance: suppose A has properties a, b, and c; while B has b, c, and d; and C has c, d, and e; while D has d, e, and f. Although A has nothing in common with D, it is sufficiently like B for them both to have the same name — and likewise with B and C and with C and D. Of course in actual examples the situation is a much richer one, with subtle and overlapping similarities, as with the word "game" — though patience and hockey have no common item of content, or at least none which would help to define "game", they are both called games. To call something a game is to place it in a family rather than to ascribe it some complex essence. Similarly, perhaps, with "religion" — we can place both early Buddhism and early Islam in the same family, even though they have nothing obvious or important in common. Thus appeal to the notion of "family resemblance" has at least the following two advantages. First, and negatively, it discourages attempts to define "religion" in an essentialist manner, which leads to misinterpretations accruing upon trying to formulate some common insight in all faiths — there may be different sorts of spiritual insight. Second, and positively, it allows of a sort of disjunctive account of religion: thus, for instance (and crudely), the activities and doctrines associated with worship, sacrifice, *bhakti*, etc., on the one hand, and those associated with the yogic endeavour towards inner enlightenment and with other similar endeavours on the other hand, are two centrally important items in a number of major religions; but we need not insist on the central presence of both or of any particular one of these items for something to count as a religion.

Finally, by reserving the term "numinous" for describing entities and experiences which inspire worship, awe, dread, etc., as well as those objects, places, etc., intimately associated with these, we can take a new look at mysticism. First, *à propos* of Otto, we avoid a mistaken mode of classification: for because of his conviction that the "soul" is a numinous entity and that numinousness is central to religion, he was led to say that every higher faith includes in some way a belief in the soul.¹⁹ This means that Buddhism, despite its *anattā* (non-soul) doctrine, has to be subsumed under the heading of

“soul-mysticism”. Second, more importantly, by taking agnostic mysticism as the “typical” or “pure” variety, in the sense explained before, one is faced by a number of interesting and fruitful questions. Why should it seem natural to take this kind of experience as intimately connected with the numinous object of worship? And on the doctrinal level, why should concepts seemingly arrived at in different ways (such as *Brahman* and *Ātman*) be said in some way to coalesce? It is not sufficient to yield to the ever-present temptation in discussing these matters of saying that concepts are not important in themselves, but point to something beyond. For it is at least a *prima facie* difficulty that a concept pointing towards a Power beyond, and sustaining, the visible world should be so closely related to one which points towards a mystical “inner” experience. Nevertheless, we have already observed that there is a loose resemblance—though not so loose that the plasticity of religious language cannot absorb it—between some of the epithets of nirvana and some of those ascribed to God. Thus a theistic interpretation of mysticism is possible, though it is not absolutely forced on one. We may put the point another way, by reference to a classic example, by saying that though it may be a deep insight that *Brahman* and *Ātman* are one, this is not an analytic or necessary truth, since the concepts are arrived at along different paths and are connected with different sorts of spiritual activity: it is a welding together of initially different insights. The varying weights put upon the activities and insights by different sects and faiths, moreover, goes a long way towards explaining doctrinal differences—once the types of doctrine associated with each are discriminated. Otto has done much here in his *Mysticism East and West* and elsewhere; but his somewhat wavering treatment of “soul-mysticism” and his comparative neglect of nirvana militated against a successful chemistry of mystical, theistic, and mixed doctrines, for one element was not first isolated in its pure form.

¹ Hereafter I use “nirvana” by itself to stand for Buddhist *nirvāṇa*.

² *The Idea of the Holy*, trans. J. W. Harvey, 2nd Edition, London (1950), p. 39.

³ Nirvana does, however, undergo some transformation in the Mahāyāna schools. For instance, on the Mādhyamika view, the Absolute (*tattva*, *śūnya*) is the same as *prajñā* (wisdom, i.e. non-dualistic insight, *jñānam advayam*) (Mādh. Kārikā, xxv, 19-20). This in turn is identified with the *dharmakāya* or Truth-Body of the Buddhas. Now the knowledge of the Absolute is nirvana

(ibid., xviii, 5); and thus there is, via the Three Body doctrine, a fairly close relation between nirvana as the attainment of non-dualistic insight and the numinous as displayed in the *sambhogakāya* and *nirmāṇakāya* of the Buddhas—in these forms the Buddhas come to be objects of worship.

⁴ Trans. B. L. Bruce and R. C. Payne, London (1932), p. v.

⁵ On contemporary feeling about this, see R. L. Slater, *Paradox and Nirvana*, Chicago (1951), p. 31.

⁶ *The Idea of the Holy*, p. 11.

⁷ E.g. U Agga in Shwe Zan Aung's "Dialogue on Nibbana", *Journal of the Burmese Research Society*, VIII, Pt. iii (1918), quoted in Slater, op. cit., pp. 54 ff, where survival is of "one's own mind purged from corruption".

⁸ Such concepts as "Ultimate Reality", "Being", etc., often have a specifically religious, not just philosophical, function, and are frequently found in close connection, though also a state of tension, with notions of a personal divinity: e.g. *nirguṇam* and *saguṇam* Brahman and the chain of identities in the Mahāyānist Three-Body doctrine. See Otto, *Mysticism East and West*, pp. 5 ff, and my article "Being and the Bible", *Review of Metaphysics*, Vol. IX, no. 4 (June 1956).

⁹ E. J. Thomas, *The Life of Buddha as Legend and History*, London, (1927), p. 20f.

¹⁰ More precisely the Buddha used the more comprehensive four-fold (*cātuṣkoṭika*) negation: the *arahat* is not reborn, nor is he not reborn, nor is he both reborn and not reborn, nor is he neither reborn nor not reborn (*Majjhima Nikāya*, i. 426ff and elsewhere). As to survival, however, it would be better for the ordinary uninstructed man to mistake the body for the self (*Saṃyutta Nikāya*, ii. 95).

¹¹ E.g. the last stage of meditation (*jhāna*) is where one is "beyond the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception" in which there is a cessation of both perception and sensation.

¹² I.e., it is not caused in any ordinary sense, though the way to it has been pointed out by the Buddha (*Milinda-Pañha*, IV. 7. 14).

¹³ The usual Pali term is *sa-upādisesa* as opposed to *anupādisesa nibbāna* (nirvana with and without substrate: see Buddhaghosa in *Dhammapada Commentary*, ii. 163—*sa-upādisesa n.* is equivalent to *kilesa-vaṭṭassa khepittatta*, "destruction of the cycle of impurity").

¹⁴ *Mysticism East and West*, p. 143.

¹⁵ *The Idea of the Holy*, pp. 58-9.

¹⁶ *Mysticism East and West*, p. 143.

¹⁷ *Systematic Theology*, Vol. I, London (1951), p. 15.

¹⁸ See L. Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations*, trans. G. E. M. Anscombe, Oxford (1953), p. 32e.

¹⁹ *Mysticism East and West*, p. 143.

EXISTENTIALISM AND ASCETICAL THEOLOGY

H. P. OWEN

THOSE who have studied the Christian Existentialists, particularly Kierkegaard and Bultmann, may have been struck by resemblances between their type of Existentialism and ascetical theology. These resemblances are not surprising when we remember that, as a matter of historical fact, Existentialism is closely related to the main tradition of Christian spirituality. Bultmann and, let us say, Thomas à Kempis differ considerably in their style and idiom; but in their basic intention they are at one; for both seek to bring men to a proper understanding of themselves (*Selbstverständnis*) in the light of God's revelation in Jesus Christ.

In this article I propose to examine two points (more, doubtless, can be discovered) in which the Existentialist and ascetical theologians agree. These points, I venture to believe, concern the very essence of the spiritual life. Since this is a purely descriptive essay I shall not attempt to argue for the validity of either point; but the fact that both occupy such a prominent place in the outlook of such diverse thinkers suggests that they constitute invariable elements in the Christian experience of God.

I shall take Kierkegaard and Bultmann as representatives of Christian Existentialism, for reasons that are obvious enough. To choose from the wealth of ascetical theology is a more difficult task. I have chosen Jean Pierre de Caussade, partly because he speaks in a language that the ordinary believer can understand (even when he speaks of realities that the ordinary believer has not experienced), but, chiefly, because he exhibits to a high degree, and with a rare intensity, those characteristics that I hope to elucidate.

I

The first characteristic that Christian Existentialism and ascetical theology have in common is a stress upon the necessity of *present commitment* to the will of God. This stress is particularly marked in the writings of Caussade. Of the many quotations that could be adduced the following will suffice.

The Order of God fills all our moments, one by one. It flows on under a thousand different guises, which successively becoming our present duty, form, increase and consummate the New Man in us up to that

plentitude for which the divine wisdom has destined us. The "one thing necessary" is what each moment produces by God's Order. In this consists the stripping, the self-abnegation, the renunciation of the creature in order to be nothing by or for itself, in order to remain as regards everything in God's Order at his pleasure, finding one's only contentment in bearing the present moment, as if there were nothing else in the world to expect.¹

This stress on the present is also characteristic of Existentialism. In Kierkegaard's thought each present "instant" of decision, each unique "Now" of existential choice, is the occasion when eternity crosses time and man is confronted with the transcendent God. Religion is not an escape from the present into the historical past or an imaginary future; one is religious either in the present or not at all. "In relation to the absolute there is only one tense: the present. For him who is not contemporary with the absolute—for him it has no existence" (Auden, p. 150).

Bultmann restates Kierkegaard in terms of Biblical eschatology. Each encounter with God, he says, brings time to its end, for it means the fulfilment of time in a "present" that reveals eternity.² Once again we are told that God is not known outside time; rather "he is the mysterious, enigmatic power that meets us *in* the world and *in* time";³ he is known in each moment of present choice. Moreover, Bultmann describes commitment (an existentialist category which he admits is peculiarly Christian) in language that strikingly resembles that of Caussade. To commit oneself to God is to become as nothing in his presence in order that one may live simply by his grace.⁴

The Christian's attitude towards the world is a "dialectical" one. Bultmann's favourite text here (which he cites continually) is 1 Cor. 7. 31, where St Paul tells his converts "to have dealings with the world" yet "so to deal with it as if they had no dealings with it". The Christian is "in" the world yet not "of" it. He commits himself to the world (in so far as he acts in time); yet he remains detached from the world (in so far as all his actions are governed by a prior commitment to the eternal God). Caussade does not, of course, use the word "dialectic"; he prefers the words "indifference" and "detachment"; but when he speaks of "the reduction of all creatures, first into nothing and then into the particular point of God's Order" (p. 83) he is affirming Bultmann's dialectical principle in all but name.

Caussade and the Existentialists agree also in the way in which they relate the subjective and objective elements in the religious life. As is well known, the whole of Existentialism is founded on the contrast between the passionless, "objective" attitude of the spectator and the passionate, "subjective" attitude of the actor. So Kierkegaard, having correlated the objective attitude with the act of thinking (i.e. the act of *discursive thought*) and the subjective attitude with the act of willing (i.e., the *existential* act of will), held that the will could attain to truth that the reason could never hope to understand.

This contrast between objectivity and subjectivity, reason and will, leads Kierkegaard to conceive the movement of faith as a "leap into darkness", an apprehension by the will of a reality that can receive no illumination (or, at any rate, no illumination that is proportionate to conviction) from the intellect. In words that have by now become famous, "*An objective uncertainty held fast in the approximation—process of the most passionate inwardness is the truth, the highest truth attainable for an existing individual. The truth is precisely the venture which chooses an objective uncertainty with the passion of the infinite*" (Auden, pp. 105-6). Bultmann writes to the same effect at the close of his last essay in *Kerygma and Myth* (pp. 210-11).

It is certainly not my intention to suggest that the ascetical theologians draw these contrasts as completely as they are drawn by Kierkegaard and Bultmann. The absolute form that the contrasts assume in modern Existentialism derives partly from Luther (as Bultmann's quotations show), and partly from Kant. Nevertheless, the Platonic-Augustinian tradition of Christian thought, with its emphasis on the will rather than the reason and on love rather than knowledge, enabled Caussade to state that "sanctity consists in *willing* what happens to us by God's Order" (p. 24), and that in the act of self-abandonment "darkness takes the place of light, knowledge is ignorance, and we see without seeing" (p. 33). God is so far concealed in the ordinary and the familiar that objective thought can never detect him; only faith can discern his presence, and "faith asks for no proofs" (p. 68).

The obscurity of faith is, indeed, an offence, an occasion for despair. Yet it is through this despair that God is most intimately known.

It is no doubt a great blow, as of death, to the soul, this loss of the sight of the Divine Will which retires from before her eyes to take up a position behind her, as it were, and impels her forward, being no longer her clearly conceived object but becoming her invisible principle (p. 110).

When the soul rebels against this condition she rebels against the very presence of God himself.

Your sufferings, your actions, your *attraits* are, as it were, the sacramental species under which God gives himself to you, while you are off chasing your sublime ideas. But God will not come to you clothed in their splendour (p. 114).

God comes to us in poverty and deprivation, as he came in Jesus of Nazareth. Caussade affirms the Divine Incognito as impressively as any Existentialist.

Ask the inhabitants of Bethlehem, see what they think of this child: if he were lodged in a palace surrounded with the state of a prince, they would pay their court to him. But ask the same question of Mary, Joseph, the Magi, the shepherds: they will tell you that they find in this extreme poverty something which makes God greater and more lovable. The very deficiency in the order of the senses enhances, increases and enriches, Faith; the less for the eyes, the more for the soul (p. 28).

These two principles—present commitment and subjective awareness—lead Caussade to formulate the experiential character of Christian truth in words that Kierkegaard and Bultmann could wholeheartedly endorse.

We are only well instructed by the words that God speaks to us personally. It is not by reading or historical study that we become wise in the science of God. What instructs us is what happens to us from moment to moment; that is what forms in us that experimental science which Jesus Christ willed to acquire before he taught it. We only know perfectly what experience has taught us through suffering and action (p. 43).

3

These affinities between Existentialist and ascetical theology should not, however, be allowed to obscure certain vital differences. In concluding I should like to note two differences which serve to distinguish the contexts in which each form of spirituality is meant to operate.

(a) The Existentialists, and Bultmann in particular, lack the idea of divine immanence. Bultmann's dominant image, which he shares with Brunner, for depicting the relation between man and God is that of an "encounter" (*Begegnung*) with the Word of apostolic preaching. Bultmann's doctrine of original sin is so extreme that he is bound to regard man as utterly deprived of God's Word until such an encounter has occurred. And even for Christians who have experienced encounters, the Word remains a spoken, an external Word. God *speaks* to the disciple; he does not *indwell* him. The Holy Spirit is a "myth" which must be "demythologized" in terms of an "encounter".

If we turn to Caussade we find another, much more profound, presupposition. God, as St Augustine and St Bonaventure taught, is actually present in the depths of the soul, even when we fail to recognize his presence; the God "without" is also always the God "within".

Truly, said Jacob, God was in this place and I knew it not. You are seeking God, dear soul, and he is everywhere, everything cries his name to you, everything gives him to you, he passes at your side, around you, *within* you, and crosses your path, he remains with you and you still seek him. Ah, you are seeking the idea of God, *while you possess his substance*, you are pursuing perfection, and it is there all the while in everything that comes to meet you (p. 114, *italics mine*).

(b) The spirituality of the ascetics is throughout an ascent of the soul to God through prayer. It is, perhaps, one of the most astonishing things about the Christian Existentialists that (with the exception of Marcel) prayer occupies hardly any place in their thought. This lack corresponds to their refusal to entertain the idea of divine immanence. Because they lack the notion of an indwelling God they fail to see that the ultimate aim of the Christian is not only to obey God's will, but actually to be united to his will—to be united in so close a fashion that Christ becomes "formed",⁵ in us, and we are made "partakers of the divine nature".⁶

The result of this deficiency with regard to prayer (and contemplative prayer in particular) is that the Existentialists exaggerate the "active" element in the spiritual life. One must be always "listening" to God's command, always engaged in moral "choice". Existentialism of the Kierkegaardian type has no place for "passive" prayer, for the "direct act" of pure adoration that Caussade held to be

within the reach of all. In short, Existentialism can hardly be regarded as a *complete* preparation for heaven, if, as we are told, man's final bliss is to *enjoy* God for ever.

¹ *Self-Abandonment to Divine Providence*, pp. 13 and 46. All my references to Caussade are to the English translation of *L'Abandon* by A. Thorold (Burns and Oates, 1955). For Kierkegaard I have used W. H. Auden's *Selections* (Cassell, 1955), and for Bultmann the English translation of *Kerygma and Myth* (S.P.C.K., 1953) and the *Essays* (S.C.M., 1955) which are translated from the second volume of *Glauben und Verstehen*.

² *Kerygma and Myth*, pp. 113-15, 118.

³ *Essays*, p. 9.

⁴ *Essays*, pp. 53-4, 81-2.

⁵ Gal. 4. 19.

⁶ 2 Pet. 1. 4.

MATINS AND ANTE-COMMUNION

J. A. THURMER

THE late Dom Gregory Dix is reported to have said that Prayer Book revision should begin with Matins and the Ante-communion.¹ It would be interesting to know how he would have proceeded. The purpose of this article is to review some attempts made so far, and to suggest that, at least for Sundays, nothing short of *integration* will ultimately prove satisfactory.

I

The Prayer Book assumes that the Eucharistic rite will be preceded and prepared for by Matins, (Litany), and Ante-communion with sermon. A fuller liturgical preparation could hardly be imagined, and it might still be admirable if congregations spent the whole of Sunday morning in church, with breaks to separate the services.² But people do not now do this and are not likely to; our worship is more intense and concentrated than that of our sixteenth-century forefathers. Most people come to only one service, and find their attention and patience greatly strained if it lasts longer than about an hour and a quarter. It hardly needs saying, therefore, that Matins, Litany, and Communion as a continuous service is too long and repetitive, and in its existing form has ceased to be a practical possibility. The reasons which have led, in the last hundred years, to our diverse presentation of the Prayer Book services are well known. They have brought about the dilemma of *either* Matins or Sung Eucharist as the principal service, and the choice has involved more than merely liturgical considerations. Fortunately, theology gives neither side an excuse for complete self-satisfaction. The Matins man must admit that Word-and-Sacrament (in that order) is the standard of the early Church and of the Prayer Book. His opposite number, on the other hand, is rarely satisfied with the Eucharistic rite as it stands, and his dissatisfaction cannot be attributed simply to perversity or disloyalty. The underlying fault in both cases is the abandonment of the Prayer Book pattern; the remedy lies in a return to the pattern, but in a concentrated and workable form.

There have been, in recent years, four significant ways of trying to do this.

1. *Victorian "High Matins"*. This is the lineal descendant of what, until about a hundred years ago, was the universal Anglican Sunday morning service—Matins, Litany, and Ante-communion. The fact that, in its present form, it has received harsh treatment from liturgical purists should not obscure its practical merits. Assuming that there has been an early Communion, it tacks on to Matins one main part of the Ante-communion only—the sermon. When Communion follows, it was (and is) not uncommon to begin at "Ye that do truly". This also has called forth the scorn of liturgists.³ But it might reasonably be maintained that "High Matins" is in itself an adequate "service of the word" in preparation for the Eucharist proper. The primitive preparation consisted of, (a) Bible-reading and psalmody, (b) Sermon, (c) Intercessions;⁴ and although it does not follow any early pattern in detail, Matins as commonly presented provides these three features, and provides them better than does the Ante-communion. There is a reason for this, and also a reason why it has not been more widely realized. Both reasons will be suggested later.

2. *The Frere-1928 Proposals*. In a penetrating and scholarly analysis made nearly fifty years ago⁵ Dr Frere recognized the necessity of maintaining the Prayer Book pattern in a shortened form. He proposed⁶ to end Matins with the Benedictus and a fixed collect. The Litany up to the Kyries would then follow, and the Eucharist would begin with the collect for the day. "1928" follows the main outlines of this. It is more radical in making the Litany entirely optional, less radical in requiring that the Eucharist shall still begin with Lord's Prayer, collect for purity, and commandments or substitute.

This modification, possessing such authority as belongs to "1928" as a whole, is probably followed fairly widely on weekdays; but it does not seem to have found favour as a pattern for Sunday. (The memorandum of the Church of England Liturgical Commission⁷ rather oddly does not mention it in its "estimate of the extent to which the 1928 Book is being used"). Moreover, as a unified act of worship it is open to serious objection. If the Litany is used there is still a double intercession (though Frere recognized the necessity "to concentrate the intercessory element").⁸ In any case there is a duplication of biblical material. We reach the New Testament lesson and the Benedictus only to go back to preparatory matter

and perhaps a "portion of scripture" from the Old Testament before arriving again at Gospel and Creed.

The American and Canadian revisions go further than "1928" and allow Matins to end with the *Te Deum*,⁹ making it thereby little more than an Old Testament prelude to the Eucharist. This modification acquires considerable significance in the light of the suggestions which follow.

3. *Influence of the "Liturgical Movement"*. Recent theology has emphasized the necessity of preparing for the Eucharistic act by a full scriptural "re-calling" of God's redemptive acts under both Covenants; and liturgical study has shown how this was done in the great liturgies of the past. By both standards the Prayer Book Ante-communion is inadequate, especially in Old Testament material. The Dean of Lincoln, in his address to the Anglican Congress at Minneapolis in 1954,¹⁰ drew attention to the whole matter here under discussion. He suggested the provision at the Eucharist of an Introit psalm, and an Old Testament lesson and second psalm after the collect, as already provided in the "Liturgy for India", and permitted in that of the Church of South India. The Editorial committee of the Congress included the Dean's suggestion among its recommendations;¹¹ it is echoed by Fr S. M. Gibbard, S.S.J.E.,¹² and commended twice by the English Liturgical Commission's report.¹³

This solution, coming as it does with such weight of authority, looks like becoming "official". It may be permissible therefore to ask the following questions in connection with it.

(a) What becomes of Matins? If it were untouched, there would be an even greater overall duplication, which would in some places relegate it more firmly than at present to a clerical limbo. Probably it was a feeling of this sort which prompted the Editorial committee of the Minneapolis Congress to follow its commendation of the Dean's proposal with a tribute to Matins and Evensong, and a plea "that they continue to hold their place in the corporate worship of the church".¹⁴ This puts us back in square one; for as they now stand, Matins and the Eucharist cannot *both* hold the central place on Sunday morning.

(b) Is the demand for a fixed Introit psalm a wise one? Custom and liturgical psychology alike suggest that ordinary congregations should begin their service with what comes more naturally to them—a metrical hymn. Let them sing psalmody a little later, when all

are well settled in their places and more firmly held by the spirit of worship.

(c) Is a pattern of three variable readings a desirable innovation? We have inherited two only at all our regular services, and experience seems to show that this is geared to our needs. Nor should we be too much influenced by primitive precedent. It is not our business to re-create the *details* of past worship.

4. *St Wilfrid's, Halton, Leeds.* It remains to mention the interesting usage at Halton.¹⁵ For some time the parish experimented with the Frere-1928 proposals in various forms. "During this whole period", says Canon Southcott,¹⁶ "we had been feeling after some integration of Matins and Parish Communion." The resulting service retained the entire Ante-communion and all "1928" Matins except the second lesson. But it amalgamated them in an unprecedented way. It begins with Matins from "O Lord, open thou our lips" to the psalms. Then comes the Ante-communion to the collects, followed by Old Testament lesson—Te Deum—Epistle—Benedictus—Gospel, Nicene Creed, and so on.

This experiment deserves more attention than it seems in fact to have received. It entirely meets point (a) above; (b) and (c), if they are in fact objections, could still be urged against it, and it would not be difficult to suggest other criticisms. But it is a practical way of tackling the problem and we ought at least to give it the credit of doing so with courage and common sense.

2

If any attempt is to be made to take the matter further, it must be based on "a clear appreciation of the faults and merits of the existing rite".¹⁷ Such an appreciation has not always been forthcoming, partly for a reason now to be put forward. And since he who presumes to criticize others can fairly be asked to lay himself open to similar treatment, practical suggestions follow.

It used to be the custom to explain the Prayer Book as a completely original production, having no ancestor but the Bible and the wit of Thomas Cranmer. The reaction to this error goes too far when, as is not unusual, its services are equated outright with their Latin predecessors. Matins and Evensong, for example, must be made to correspond in every way with the Breviary. In practice this shows itself in such infirmities as the insertion of an "office hymn" before the Magnificat and the extinguishing of candles after the

third collect. A similar assumption underlies parts of *The Shape of the Liturgy*. Dix speaks of the "monastic origin"¹⁸ of Morning and Evening Prayer,¹⁹ and implies with characteristic irony that it is very perverse of the reformed Church of England to be so attached to these ascetic devotions of the fourth century at the expense of the genuinely primitive, dominical, and "popular" Eucharist.

Now the issuing of the Prayer Book removed, for good or ill, many of the distinctions axiomatic to Latin liturgy. It might be said that, before the Reformation, the Church's "common prayer" (excluding sacramental acts and ceremonies) consisted of:

- (a) the eight services of the Breviary,
- (b) the first part of the Mass,
- (c) the vernacular instruction and devotions attached to the sermon, called the Prone.²⁰

Of these, (c) concerned the laity most, and loomed large in the minds of the Reformers. The effect of Cranmer's liturgical work was to throw all three into the melting-pot together. The daily services which emerged in 1552 and have remained ever since are indeed a "sanctification of the day", though simpler in plan than the Breviary. They do not, however, correspond to the Breviary only. They are also our liturgy of the Word, the complement of the sacraments and the real successors of the primitive "Mass of the catechumens". As such they are indeed amplified by what we call the Ante-communion; but to suppose that this alone in the Prayer Book corresponds to, and fulfils all the functions of, the first half of earlier Eucharistic liturgies is to make the mistake already referred to, of viewing it only through Latin spectacles. The Prayer Book Ante-communion is primarily a framework for the sermon; it is a stereotyped form of the Prone. Its basis, like that of the catechism, is the instructional Lord's Prayer, ten commandments, and creed. The homily or sermon is followed by the old bidding prayer recast as a direct intercession. There are no psalms. They are adequately represented at Matins, where, in accordance with Cranmer's principles, whole psalms are recited in course instead of the not always edifying fragments of the Missal.²¹ It may be doubted also whether Cranmer saw the ten commandments as "one unvarying lesson"²² from the Old Testament. That lesson has already been read—at Matins. Further, a direct act of praise is out of place in this primarily *instructional* office: so the Gloria in Excelsis is moved to amplify the following service of "praise and

thanksgiving", and the creed is ordered to be *said*—it is an invariable piece of instruction, not a festal canticle.²³ Collect, Epistle, and Gospel do indeed remain, the last two possibly to secure some scriptural recognition of seasons and feasts without breaking the much-stressed continuous reading of scripture in the lessons. In Cranmer's own scheme there were few "proper" lessons; even Good Friday, for example, has proper first lessons only.

If this analysis is correct, it shows why we find Cranmer's Ante-communion so unsatisfactory. A "Prone" type of service, however necessary in the sixteenth century, and however valuable still on other occasions, is not the introduction we need to the Sunday Eucharist. Accordingly many of us find its Lord's Prayer redundant (or use our Latin spectacles again and talk about "a relic of the priest's private preparation"). We leave out the commandments, make the creed once again a Sunday and festival canticle, and find the prayer for the Church unsatisfactory. Most important of all, we cannot share the Indian committee's "general satisfaction with the traditional liturgical epistles and gospels".²⁴ Merely tinkering with the details of this service does not make it satisfactory; it simply destroys the grandeur of its English.

The outline of the "service of the word" which we need already exists—in Matins, especially as amplified by additional intercessions and sermon. This, as mentioned above, was recognized in a rough and ready way by those churchmen who went straight on to "Ye that do truly"; and it is difficult to see that any essential liturgical principle is violated by this. But as a long-term policy, should we not seek an "alternative order" of Matins which would also itself be a satisfactory Ante-communion of broadly traditional shape? If we omit duplications and unwanted "Prone" material, the result need leave out nothing of real value and still not be too long. The following points may be made.

1. The real crux is the lections. It has already been suggested that we ought not to depart from the familiar arrangement of two readings per service. But the existing Matins and Ante-communion schemes are different. The first is, (a) Old Testament, (b) New Testament; the second is, (a) anything outside the four gospels, (b) anything within them. In spite of its antiquity the second seems theologically the poorer scheme. Perhaps the normal pattern for a "combined" service should be, (a) Old Testament, (b) "Gospel"; for short passages from the epistles (especially of St Paul) often do not

read satisfactorily out of their context (Sexagesima!) and it might not be a bad thing if most Sunday epistle-reading were done in the more leisurely circumstances of Evensong. Some epistle-passages would certainly be wanted in the morning, and it is arguable that appropriate ones might properly be introduced by the formula "The holy Gospel is written in—". (This presumably means the gospel in the primary sense, as proclaimed—at least indirectly—by the whole New Testament. If it does not it is tautology and should be changed.)²⁵

This integrating of Epistle and Gospel with the Matins lessons might indeed seem a radical change. But there is a hint of it already in the 1662 practice of making the Gospel sometimes a continuation of the second lesson; and "proper" lessons are now a well-established feature of our rite. Further, if the Church of England can revise its lectionary drastically four times in less than a century, there seems no logical reason why the antique and haphazard selection of Eucharistic readings should be for ever shielded from the insights of biblical study and the changing needs of the Church. Doubtless the fact that they are printed in full in our Prayer Books has had much to do with our attitude. But if following the text is desired, is it not time a biblical Church encouraged the following of it in real Bibles?

2. With the lesson structure settled, the general plan of the service presents no insuperable difficulties. The "Gospel" would be followed, as at present, by the Nicene creed. A psalm would precede the Old Testament lesson—our Matins scheme here being preferred to any detailed re-creation of "primitive" patterns. Psalmody so used would not be a "cover" for movement; though sung by all, it is a further lesson, as St Augustine calls the gradual psalm of his day.²⁶ A suitable canticle would separate the readings. The Benedictus suggests itself, on the analogy of the very successful position of the Magnificat at Evensong. There might well be alternatives.²⁷ The collect for the day, coming before the psalm, would, following its original function, introduce the whole course of scriptural material, and might be the proper "official" beginning of the service. Or it might begin, much as at present, with the collect for purity and the Kyries.

3. It should be permissible to conduct such a service as Matins is usually presented—that is, from a stall or reading desk, with lessons read—not necessarily by clergymen—from the lectern Bible. This

would preserve that corporate downsitting and uprising of priest and people in meditative listening and praise, which contrasts favourably with the restless discomfort and emphasis on ceremonial trivialities too often accompanying the presentation of the Ante-communion to-day.

4. The service suggested has no single feature in common with Evensong (except the collect for the day, and than in a different position). Would not this be an advantage, and encourage attendance both morning and evening? In Evensong Cranmer's "office" would remain unimpaired once in every daily scheme of worship.

5. A form of Prime would be available for clergy and others desiring a special service for the beginning of the day. "1928" used Prime as a repository for the Athanasian creed. It might also include morning psalms not used at the Eucharist, and the fixed collects of Morning Prayer.

6. In the "alternative order" here suggested nothing would prevent the insertion of other rites and ceremonies in accordance with the proper Prayer Book pattern. Deacons would be ordained before, and priests after the Gospel as usual. Baptism would be allowed "after the second lesson" (i.e. the Gospel)—a provision which might be useful for adult candidates. Rites which the Prayer Book expects now between Matins and Ante-communion (Confirmation, Marriage, Churching) might, where desired, come after the Nicene creed.

7. The details of the Eucharistic intercession are beyond the scope of this article. The question has recently been dealt with fully by Mr E. C. Whitaker.²⁸ As he concluded, the intercession belongs to the "service of the Word" rather than to the Eucharist proper. It must therefore come either at the beginning, or at the end, of the revised service. Probably the latter position is preferable, and follows existing Anglican custom. On certain special occasions such as ordinations, it might still take the form of the Litany at the beginning; in such cases there would be no further intercession later in the service. It seems likely that intercessory prayer by biddings and silences (with or without concluding collects) will commend itself. This is already popular with us "after the third collect", and if used before the offertory of the Eucharist, would be the primitive form of intercession in the primitive position.²⁹

At Minneapolis the Dean of Lincoln made a plea for the retention of the "landmarks" of our existing public worship,³⁰ and the

liturgical commission's report suggested as a principle of revision that it should be conservative—by which “we mean that it should conserve all that is good in our existing heritage of public worship”.³¹ Few would disagree. But a conservative revision as thus defined will not be achieved by tinkering timidity. It will be achieved only by a bold modification of details in order to preserve the characteristic balance of the Prayer Book pattern, and so achieve for the present generation the aim which the “liturgical movement” shares with Thomas Cranmer—a truly biblical, corporate, and popular liturgy.³²

¹ J. T. Martin, *Christ Our Passover*, 1958, p. 87 n. 2.

² Cf. P. Dearmer, *The Parson's Handbook*, 1903, ch. V, “Times of Services”.

³ Cf. G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 1945, p. 551 n. 3.

⁴ Cf. G. Dix, op. cit. ch. III.

⁵ W. H. Frere, *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform*, 1911.

⁶ Op. cit., ch. VI.

⁷ *Prayer-Book Revision in the Church of England*, 1957, pp. 15 f.

⁸ W. H. Frere, op. cit. p. 156.

⁹ The Irish revision allows this when the Litany is used.

¹⁰ *Anglican Congress 1954; Report of Proceedings*, pp. 97 f.

¹¹ Op. cit., p. 198.

¹² *Studies in Ephesians*, 1956, ed. F. L. Cross, pp. 116-17.

¹³ Op. cit., pp. 24, 36.

¹⁴ Op. cit., p. 198.

¹⁵ E. W. Southcott, *The Parish Comes Alive*, 1956, ch. III.

¹⁶ Op. cit., p. 31.

¹⁷ E. C. Whitaker, *The Intercessions of the Prayer Book*, 1956, p. 60.

¹⁸ P. 442 n.

¹⁹ Even with reference to the “origins” in the fourth century this is disputed, e.g. by E. C. Ratcliff in *Liturgy and Worship*, 1932, pp. 257-9.

²⁰ See F. E. Brightman, *The English Rite*, 1921, Vol. II, pp. 1037 f.

²¹ Cf. G. Dix, op. cit., pp. 360 f.

²² D. C. Dunlop, *Anglican Congress Report*, p. 90.

²³ Permission to sing it returned in 1662, at which revision incidental improvements often “spoil the finish of Cranmer's workmanship” (Dix, op. cit., p. 660).

²⁴ *Principles of Prayer Book Revision*, 1957, p. 25. The Committee add: “the chief credit [for them] is due to Archbishop Cranmer”. In fact nearly all come from the Sarum missal, though with some shuffling. See Dix, op. cit. p. 364 n. 2.

²⁵ Cf. W. K. Lowther-Clarke, *The Prayer Book of 1928 Reconsidered*, 1943, p. 36.

²⁶ e.g. Serm. 49. I, 176. I.

²⁷ Is it fussy to suggest that the Te Deum is too much an anticipation of the Sanctus for compulsory use in the Ante-communion? It might be left as an independent festal item, to be used alone (cf. Accession service) or at the end of any service, as at the Coronation.

²⁸ *The Intercessions of the Prayer Book*, 1956.

²⁹ Cf. the Latin rite of Good Friday.

³⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 95.

³¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

³² Since this article was written, its subject has been considered by two important authorities. (i) E. C. Ratcliff in his address to the 1958 Eucharistic Congress, "Principles Governing Liturgical Reform" (*The World for God*, 1958, pp. 65-67). The present writer is encouraged to find that his view of the existing Ante-communion accords in a number of ways with that of Professor Ratcliff. (ii) The 1958 Lambeth Conference, in the report of the sub-committee on 'The Book of Common Prayer' (*The Lambeth Conference 1958*, Part 2, pp. 82-83). Both Professor Ratcliff and the report of the Lambeth committee (of which the Dean of Lincoln was a member) give general support to the ideas of I (3) above. The prestige of this solution is thus enhanced; but satisfactory answers to the questions asked above in connection with it are still awaited.

THE MYSTICISM OF CHARTRES

RHYS S. JONES

TO ENTER the rich, dim interior of Notre-Dame de Paris is a satisfying experience; it fills the soul with sensuous delight. Little wonder it so gripped the Romantic imagination of Victor Hugo. To enter the great Cathedral at Chartres, wholly dominating the town as it does, is also satisfying—but in a totally different way. The peaceful, pristine bareness around one fills the soul with what I can describe only as suprasensuous pleasure, a mystical, other-worldly delight. No wonder at all that this place, too, has its celebrant writers, notably J. K. Huysmans (1848-1907) in his famous novel *La Cathédrale*. Our main concern in this paper, however, is not Huysmans but Paul Valéry, the greatest Symbolist poet France has produced in this century. It was *through* Huysmans, nevertheless, that Valéry, too, succumbed to the spell of Chartres.

Huysmans, a French writer of Dutch extraction, is chiefly remembered for a series of novels describing the gradual conversion of an imaginary hero, Durtal, to Catholicism and mysticism. Durtal first appears in *Là-bas*, but it is in Huysmans's next novel, *En Route*, that we are given an account of his conversion. In the third novel of the series, *La Cathédrale*, we find a symbolist interpretation of the architecture of Chartres cathedral which, by magnificently evoking the spirit of the place, captivated Valéry's interest. Five years later Huysmans published *L'Oblat*, another novel about Durtal—but that does not now concern us.

Shortly after the appearance of *La Cathédrale* in 1898, Valéry jotted down some comments on it, and years later, in 1925, he put them into print under the title: *Durtal, ou les Points d'une Conversion*. The result was a remarkable little essay revealing his personal conception of mysticism. Conversion? Mysticism? At first sight, it seems almost impossible that a man whose choice for his own epitaph was simply "FIN" should have anything constructive to say on such subjects. But this is not so at all.

What originally prompted Valéry to jot down his reflections on Durtal-Huysmans (the novels were largely autobiographical) is not hard to discover. "When *The Cathedral* appeared", he says, "the idea came to me to seize the occasion to show my feelings for the author." Valéry, it seems, felt a certain affection for Huysmans. "He had always treated me as a friend. I even owed him good advice

and recommendation in Government circles . . . I went quite often to his home in the *rue de Sèvres*, or would catch him about five o'clock at his office in the *Sûreté*." Quite apart from this personal connection, however, it was an earlier book by Huysmans—*A Rebours*—which had helped the young Valéry to appreciate, perhaps for the first time, the genius of Mallarmé, his future master and the outstanding Symbolist poet of the nineteenth century. In short, Valéry's interest in Huysmans arose from a feeling of indebtedness which was both personal and literary.

But do not imagine that this sense of gratitude made it easier for him to write about Durtal and Huysmans. "His temperament and ideas were the opposite of mine", says Valéry in the *Ad Lectorem* of his 1925 publication. "I was a blind man having to speak with precision about colours", with the result that "I didn't know which language to use, I floated between his and my own. The outcome was a foregone conclusion: neither he nor I was satisfied." Huysmans did not like it because Valéry's conception of mysticism was so different from his own—which was essentially devotional; and Valéry was displeased because he knew his portrayal of Durtal had little in common with Huysmans's Durtal. This doubtless explains the long delay in publication of the notes. Valéry was really interpreting mysticism in his own image—a fact which he both knew and, in a way, regretted. Even in 1925 he attempted to safeguard himself by saying: "I am going to risk a few suppositions, at the same time emphasizing that I am in no way examining religious belief itself" (i.e., in particular, Huysmans's beliefs). Valéry is merely employing his favourite solipsistic trick of using another person's protagonist to describe himself.

Before going further, let us see what kind of self Valéry had. To do so will make it easier to understand his interest in and conception of Durtal. As might be expected of an introspective writer, he had considerable insight into the problems of his own mind. Complex minds are almost always in a state of conflict, and Valéry's was no exception. What exactly was his conflict?

I

Writing of the formative years of his life, Valéry once said: "Thus was revealed to me the conflict which was doubtless potential in my nature, between a leaning towards poetry and a strange need to satisfy all the exigencies of my mind. I have tried to

preserve both of these." The former is easy to understand: part of Valéry wanted to become a poet. But his poetry must not come easily to him; in emerging it must satisfy that other side of his nature, "the exigencies of his mind". What were these?

When, in 1919, Valéry wrote a *Note et Digression* about his earlier study of Leonardo da Vinci, he "digressed" in such a way as to provide a clear answer to this question. Generalizing from his own experience of the human mind, he said: "The characteristic feature of man is consciousness; and that of consciousness . . . a ceaselessly sustained detachment from all appearances, no matter of what kind." Furthermore, he goes on, "consciousness has so far withdrawn and sited itself outside everything, that it is no more than a black body which absorbs everything and yields nothing . . . In the end, it sets itself up as the daughter, directly descended and strikingly alike, of that Being without origin and visible form, upon whom bears and devolves the whole operation of the cosmos . . . A little more, and it would account necessary only two, essentially unknown, entities: Self and X. Both abstracted from everything, implicated in everything, implicating everything. Equal and substantial." Such is consciousness, as conceived by Valéry. It is, by definition, "pure"—pure abstraction and detachment, the "pure ego", the pure "Self". For convenience, we may also term it the Mystic in man; and in one such as Valéry it was this element in his nature which opposed the easy emergence of the Poet.

It may help readers to note that Valéry's use of the concept "Self" in the above passage is almost identical with that found in Indian mystic philosophy, where the word "self" (with a small s) is used to denote the so-called individual self of man and "Self" (with a capital S) to refer to Brahman, the Universal Cause and only true Self. It would be wrong to assume, however, that Valéry was steeped in Oriental lore, as in the case of a writer such as C. G. Jung. Though there is no conclusive proof, it is safer to assume that his dichotomy between pure ego and poetic ego was derived either from German idealism or perhaps from William James's famous differentiation of "pure ego" and "empirical ego".

However that may be, let us now see what Valéry has to say about the poetic self, which, in the context quoted above, he calls "la personnalité". This, we are told (in a brilliant analysis), is "merely a *thing*, mutable and accidental, as compared with the most naked Self. It is thus but a secondary psychological divinity.

which inhabits our mirror and obeys our name . . . It is of the order of the Penates. It is subject to pain and heartache, fond of perfumes like the false gods and, again like them, the temptation of verse . . . It resists not the power of wine, the niceties of speech, the witchcraft of music." Amongst many other characteristics, Valéry notes that it is our personality which experiences a sense of inferiority (and, presumably, at other times, superiority). In truth, however, it is simply an outcome of existence which figures in tables and statistics. "It began with a seminal chance, and in a microscopic incident; it has run a myriad risks, been fashioned by many experiences, and is, in short, the result of incalculable confusion . . . a plaything of love and chance."

Like produces like, so what the human personality produces is "always relative, its masterpieces are fortuitous. It thinks perishably, it thinks individually, it thinks by flukes . . . Furthermore, it isn't absolutely sure of being *anyone at all*; it disguises and denies itself more easily than it asserts itself. It lives on fictions, it solemnly espouses a thousand and one characters. Its hero is never oneself . . ."

This last defect is, in Valéry's opinion, the most grievous of all, for did he not revere Mallarmé—among others—for having been *his own* hero, so to speak, "the witness or martyr to the idea of perfection"? "A man who measures himself by himself", says Valéry, "strikes me as a superior creation which touches me more deeply than any other . . . I like it when one is hard on one's genius. If he knows not how to turn against himself, the 'genius' is to my mind nothing but natural virtuosity . . . His finished works are oddly compounded of gold and mud." Thus, out of many a poem but a few lines remain, and the very idea of "poetry" has deteriorated. But what is it that enables a man thus to "turn against himself"? "What is it that resists our being borne along by the senses, the scattering of our ideas, the weakening of memories, the gradual change in the organism, the varied and unceasing action of the universe?—It is simply *consciousness*, in its most abstract form."

Valéry's dichotomy is thus complete, and we now have a clear picture of the conflict in his mind, particularly in his youth. He felt that the Mystic and Poet in him were contradictory, even antagonistic. He sensed that the Poet, too easily subject to "the temptation of verse", had first of all to be reconciled with, and

disciplined by, the Mystic. Admittedly, this synthesis might result in his becoming, like Mallarmé, almost too fascinated by the purity and perfection of "the white page" to write at all! The Mystic-Poet might turn into an impotent mystic. But that "risk" had to be taken. An inner necessity impelled him to walk on.

Returning to *Durtal*, we shall now be able to understand more clearly the affinity which existed in Valéry's mind between mysticism and his own "Method" of personal development—a process he found to be closely akin to Leonardo's, Mallarmé's and, in a sense, Durtal's.

2

In the preliminary pages of the essay Valéry, true to his differentiation between consciousness and personality, carefully distinguishes "thought" (*la pensée*) from the "thinking personality" of a writer, the "flotsam and jetsam of his thought". In order to write coherently, the Mystic in a man has to have dealings with the Poet or Writer, who "chooses" appropriate thought-forms and then "fixes" them in written words. Thus the Writer is a kind of middle-man who, by choosing and fixing, makes it possible for the mystic author to contact his public.

Having made this introduction, Valéry next comments on the stages which, according to him, characterized Durtal's "conversion". These are as follows:

1. There is an initial shock (reminiscent of that, for example, which began Tolstoy's mystic phase), followed at once by a period of utter confusion during which the external world is lost from view, its values becoming chaotic. "At the very beginning of mystic existence, under the virginal shock, come annihilation of details and the cessation of ordinary thoughts, moral minutiae, mere actions, moments of vegetation. Everything becomes of no account or immense . . ." Nothing retains its old objective value, and the everyday world of reality seems "flabby and fleeting". The future mystic is busily preparing "a new, *personal* dictionary", and is experiencing "a redistribution in material values". The old, familiar world is in process of re-creation—and the rebirth-pangs are painful. For what may be attractive in the newly-forming mystic scale of values may, *simultaneously*, be repulsive in the sensual scale of values, and vice versa. Thus the tortures of lover or martyr, as he fluctuates between the two, can be, at one and the same time,

desirable and undesirable. In short, there exists an agonizing conflict between opposed scales of values—a Mystic-Poet conflict, such as the young Valéry himself experienced.¹ This unhappy stage in Durtal's conversion is eventually superseded by

2. "The erection of a sort of reality which is wholly individual." By this Valéry means the creation of a new, *internal* reality based not on sensual but on spiritual values,² a reality having a "solidity" of its own and able to take the place of the old external reality. But the ultimate aim is achieved only when

3. "Durtal returns to things, and they also have changed." Both he and they are so altered that the old and new realities fuse into a synthetic totality of experience which transcends the purely external and the purely internal. ". . . the new man approaches. Then, when habits have been reformed in a different way, in the changed environment there are reborn even the most trivial objects, and they say new things (*ils disent de nouvelles choses*)." Thus, just as, in the Middle Ages, Symbolry attached an agreed significance to every corner of the known world, so Huysmans grouped around a Cathedral "this extraordinary, artificial naturalness".

Between Durtal's "leaving" of things material and his subsequent "return" to them Valéry perceived a parallel to the quasi-mystical path—or "Method"—followed by conflict-ridden writers such as he. The sequence in Durtal's conversion closely resembles that which we found in discussing Valéry's conflict: natural Poet, Mystic-Poet, pure Mystic.³ Can one wonder that Valéry calls mysticism—as he understood it, or rather chose to understand it—"a sort of pure, individual branch of learning"?

In the final stages of his conversion Durtal was able, we are told, to rediscover without much difficulty "the way to the great moments of his existence". But what were just moments of ecstasy are now periods of sustained ecstasy. So Durtal, "pacified, seeks a tranquil yet impassionable spot"—a place where even inanimate objects are capable, by reason of their symbolic significance, of inducing and maintaining the mystic state. In search of this, he comes to Chartres, "and all the material means of returning to God there stand revealed". And the main attraction of Chartres? "Above all, the Church itself—a mass of stone strictly spiritual in purpose, an almost perfect machine." Spiritual intoxication born of material reality! Ecstasy! "And one hasn't even closed one's eyes! . . . The stained glass sparkles like visions one might have experienced. It

possesses imaginary colourings. One meets it unexpectedly, as one goes forward; it is abrupt, symmetrical, studied and definitive. Thus one has not left oneself . . . One discovers within a pure and sorrowing cynicism."

Having experienced all this, Durtal "at last, stops; glances back at his life and its crisis; then turns towards an enviable site, the quietest possible, the cloister." Shades of Mallarmé and Monsieur Teste! But *not* of Valéry, let it be said. Neither in youth, middle age, nor old age, did he ever follow Durtal right into the cloister; he was to remain, in the sense already defined, a Mystic-Writer. Though he claimed it was "only in the Near and Far East, and in a few cloisters of the Middle Ages, that one could really live in the path of pure, poetic perfection",⁴ though he almost forsook poetry in the last quarter century of his life, yet he continued to write. He never ceased, however, to look longingly at cloistered existence, especially in the intellectual sense. Just before war broke out in 1939, he observed that "'Symbolism' is from now onwards the nominal symbol for the state of mind and of things intellectual which is most opposed to that which to-day holds sway, and even governs. Never has the Ivory Tower seemed higher."⁵

3

What conclusions may we draw? First, that Valéry really belonged—like Flaubert, but unlike Huysmans—to the order of "mystics without God". Hence his admission in *Durtal*: "Here, I am guessing . . . I do not think one can speak of mysticism without being either a mystic or absurd." But he himself fell into neither category.

Second, in so far as he was mystically inclined, Valéry was far removed from the unconscious type of mystic conjured up by Lévy-Brühl's rather unfortunate term "participation mystique". (How can that which is perfectly *natural* to the primitive mind which is experiencing it be rightly described as "mystical"?) Nor has Valéry's mysticism anything to do with that—again wholly unconscious—"tyranny of symbolism", as it has aptly been called, which overrules the conscious reasoning of the neurotic.

Third, Valéry was not interested in mysticism merely because he was a Symbolist, i.e. because Symbolism, as C. M. Bowra and others are at pains to point out,⁶ is closely associated with the signs and symbols of religious belief.

No, Valéry's basic interest in mysticism seems rather to have lain in the fact that, particularly in his youth, he was intensely interested in himself and his inner conflicts. These heavily burdened him until well on into middle life. He naturally wanted to assuage his discomfort and, therefore, like M. Teste, he used a "mechanical sieve" to sift helpful ideas wherever he might find them. He examined any aspect of life—not only mysticism but the scientific views of Henri Poincaré, for example—which he thought might make his task easier. Somehow or other, he simply *had* to realize, as fully as possible, his personal conception of what being a poet meant. Thus, like Durtal—and *with* Durtal—he ventured to Chartres. For Valéry—as for Durtal—mysticism meant, not an unconscious tyranny of symbols, but a conscious and deliberate *utilization* of symbols (including therein even material objects) to further his psychic development as a poet and—still more important perhaps, especially in later years—as a human being.

In these anxious days one may perhaps be pardoned for speculating, in conclusion, on what Valéry might have said had he written about Durtal a quarter of a century later. In the event, he died working at the Sorbonne (the nearest he ever approached the cloister?) on 20 July 1945—a mere fortnight before mankind experienced the "virginal shock" of the first atomic explosion.⁷ One imagines that his lifelong interest in the evolution and destiny of the human mind might well have made him suggest that to-day we are *all* faced, however unwittingly, with Durtal's dilemma—the dilemma of opposed and conflicting scales of values, material and spiritual. The material objects of our world—now endowed with the power hitherto safely latent in the atom—are certainly "saying new things". The genie has escaped the lamp; he questions the eternal verities. And our problem is: can we, as a race, create—in the nick of time—a "new, personal dictionary" wherein F stands, not for fusion and fission but Faith, wherein H symbolizes, not hydrogen but Hope, and C denotes, not chaos and catastrophe, but Charity between nations? The thoughtful among us may perhaps gain insight through Durtal's sufferings. In the Atomic Age his story has become something of a parable.

¹ Cf. *Existence du Symbolisme* (1939), pp. 24-44, wherein Valéry gives a most interesting account of the spiritual awakening of a young man of 1890—of the birth, that is, of a Symbolist. That this is autobiographical is obvious in such admissions as: "He feels that he believed he loved what he does not love, and that he was forcing himself not to love what really fascinates him."

² Ibid. Continuing, Valéry points out that, having rebelled against Naturalism and *a priori* scientific doctrines (i.e. the accepted ideas of his day), the young man of 1890 discovered that "it remained for him to be himself . . . and, above all, to resolve not to accept anything which he does not feel to be a real inner necessity, the state of being awaited by his deepest self".

³ The most detailed study of this final stage ever essayed by Valéry was his portrait of "Monsieur Teste", in whose imaginary character he sketched "a Chimera of intellectual mythology". (See *Soirée avec M. Teste*, pp. 14-18.)

⁴ See *Mémoires d'un Poème* (Addendum to E. Noulet, *Paul Valéry*, Grasset, 1938), p. xliii.

⁵ *Existence du Symbolisme*, Stols (Maestricht), 1939, p. 50.

⁶ E.g., C. M. Bowra, *The Heritage of Symbolism*.

⁷ It is interesting to recall that in his last public lecture—on Voltaire—he referred to the destructiveness of war in these atypical terms: "Confronted by this state of human affairs, which indicates that man understands himself less and less—just as he seems less to understand nature as he finds therein more powerful means of action—confronted by this fantastic spectacle, would Voltaire be able to recover that celebrated smile of his we know so well? Perhaps—if one may be allowed thus to end these words about an unbeliever—there would come to his mind that supremely august saying, the truest, most simple and profound utterance ever made about mankind, and therefore about our politics, about the progress of our knowledge, about our doctrines and conflicts—perhaps he would murmur to himself this obvious conclusion: *They know not what they do*". (See M. Raymond, *Paul Valéry et la Tentation de l'Esprit*, A la Baconnière, Neuchâtel, 1946, p. 176.)

A FURTHER NOTE ON THE EPISCOPAL LICENSING OF SCHOOLMASTERS

J. ADDY

IN HER NOTE on the Licensing of Schoolmasters in England, Mrs Gladys Jenkins has contributed some useful information on the process in so far as it concerns the diocese of London. Without desiring to detract from this excellent piece of research, I feel that I can add a scrap of information noting the difference in practice in the diocese of York.

The licensing of schoolmasters in the diocese of York presents an entirely different state of affairs from that in London. The nomination papers and the correspondence that passed between the Feoffees of a school and the Archbishop's Registrar show that licensing fees were somewhat elastic. In the diocese of London these fees may, as she says, on occasion have been excessive. Available records show that the usual York fee was, as the statute provided, one shilling or even less, especially where the Feoffees state that the stipend of the schoolmaster was so low that he could not afford the standard fee and would the Registrar use his discretion (as he often did), for example at Coverham, Danby Wiske, Hudswell, Holme, Fingall, and other parishes.

A licence was not always issued when a master entered upon his school. Evidence exists in the large collection of nomination papers (R.. IV N), to show that a master often taught for one or sometimes two years before he was licensed. This procedure would doubtless facilitate his dismissal if he should prove to be unsatisfactory.

The Archdeacon's Court Books show that a schoolmaster presented for persistently teaching *sine licentia* was punished by a fine. In the Archdeaconry of Richmond the schoolmasters at Hudswell, Fingall, and Danby Wiske as well as schoolmasters from other parishes had to pay one shilling licence fee plus three shillings and fourpence Court fees, the whole process being dealt with at the Visitation centre. Schoolmasters who appeared in the Consistory Court were involved in other matters than licensing, as may be seen in the interesting case of brawling in church by the grammar school boys of Cawthorne, near Barnsley, in 1618.

But so far as I know in York, jurisdiction upon unlicensed schoolmasters did not lie with the Consistory Court. For that matter the

Ecclesiastical Commission, an offshoot of the Council of the North, took a hand in dealing with unsatisfactory schoolmasters, as at Ripon and Bradford in 1570. But here again I think it was the schoolmaster's incompetence rather than the lack of a licence which brought fine or even dismissal by the court.

I suggest then, quite tentatively, that Mr Tate's original may well be correct. It is likely that Philip Stubbs included the court fines with his fees in order to make his attack on the ecclesiastical courts more pointed and effective.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,—If any of your readers are interested in the increase of understanding of the Church of England by other Communions abroad, their help would be very welcome to the Periodicals Bureau set up by the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations. Names and addresses of members of foreign Churches anxious to read Anglican periodicals and newspapers can be supplied to readers in this country who are willing to send on regularly their own periodical after reading it.

Many inquiries come from Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Old Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed sources.

Anyone who is willing to send a copy of *The Church Quarterly Review* is invited to write (but not send the periodical) to:

The General Secretary,
The Church of England Council on Foreign Relations,
Palace Court,
222 Lambeth Road,
London, S.E.1.

JOHN R. SATTERTHWAITE
Assistant General Secretary,
Church of England Council
on Foreign Relations.

OUR LORD'S ASCENSION

SIR,—Fr Mann's reply (C.Q.R., October-December 1958) to my letter printed in the July-September issue of the C.Q.R. shows that I ought to have made it plainer than I did that it was not my intention either to affirm or to deny a "physical ascension", witnessed by certain men at a certain time, but simply to assert that, whatever other New Testament authors say or imply, Luke is saying explicitly both in his Gospel and in Acts that the Lord was taken up into heaven in the presence of the Apostles. It is not a question of metaphysics that I would raise nor of the credal statements, nor of what Fr Mann or I believes about the Ascension but of what Luke and the spurious ending of Mark say about it.

In this article Fr Mann quoted from Dr J. G. Davies's article in the *J.T.S.*, and he will by now have read the same author's recently published Bampton Lectures. Here (p. 58) Dr Davies, having pointed out that Hebraic thought is always concrete rather than abstract, suggests that Luke could do no other than use concrete terms. "When St Luke came to describe the Ascension which to him, as to his fellow New Testament writers, was the occasion of Christ's entrance into the divine presence, he did so pictorially- Christ was taken up. It would seem impossible,

however, to determine whether St Luke intended this to be understood as involving a movement in space or not. Here indeed fact and interpretation are so closely welded as to be inseparable." In other words, Luke may be using metaphor, as we use metaphor when (to cite Fr Mann's own illustration) we speak of the Queen "ascending the throne" That does not alter the fact that concrete terms and terms denoting bodily movement are employed in the one case as in the other.

Dr Davies makes out a strong case for the view that the Ascension and the preceding Resurrection are to be regarded as very closely related, and that the traditional forty days' interval is a mistaken addition to the original view of Resurrection and Ascension. In Luke's Gospel, of course, the forty days' interval is not mentioned, and it would be quite reasonable to assert that the accounts of the Third and the Fourth Gospels are essentially agreed—save that Luke has received and transmitted the tradition of the Apostles' being present at the moment of Ascension—and that Luke 24. 51, "he was carried up into heaven", is to be taken metaphorically. Acts is a very different matter, at variance, as Fr Mann points out, with the Gospel on certain points, and, incidentally, with much more concrete detail which cannot be dismissed as metaphor. To refer again to the illustration of the Queen's Ascension, if I were told the Queen had *ascended the throne* I should take that metaphor to mean simply that she had become queen; but if I were told that *the Queen had ascended the throne at a certain time and a certain place, and that while she was doing so a number of people was looking on*, I should assume that all these details were meant to be taken quite literally. Dr Davies's suggestion that Luke in Gospel and Acts was drawing upon two different accounts and not troubling to relate them to each other, or that for his own reasons he "inserted the forty days (of Acts) on his own initiative" points to a way out of our difficulties, which is carefully worked out in the Bampton Lectures (p. 49 ff).

As to Fr Mann's alarm at my "interpretation" of Mark 14. 62, I am not, of course, suggesting that the High Priest was a witness of the Ascension—it is, after all, a general "ye shall see", not a particular "thou shalt see" addressed to the High Priest alone—but simply that Mark, like Luke, thinks in concrete terms and presupposes a "three-storey universe".

Finally, I apologize for what appears to Fr Mann as a "cavalier dismissal of the massive theological structure of the Fourth Gospel". I have no special Lucan axe to grind: it simply seemed to me that Fr Mann was being rather "cavalier" with the words of St Luke.

G. F. DOWDEN

Manchester.

REVIEWS

BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE. By JAMES D. WOOD. Duckworth. 10s. 6d.

ON READING THE ENGLISH BIBLE. By T. E. JESSOP. Epworth. 5s.

THE STUDY OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY TO-DAY. By EDWARD J. YOUNG. James Clarke. 10s. 6d.

THE NATURE AND AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE. By RAYMOND ABBA. James Clarke. 21s.

ONE of great and significant religious changes in the last hundred years is that, by and large, we have ceased to be a nation of Bible readers. Perhaps even more significant is the fact that among Christian people who know and love their Bible, it is but seldom now the sole, unrivalled source of spirituality, guidance, and comfort that it was to their great-grandparents. In those days the Bible was the ultimate authority in all disputes, a text-book for all subjects. The answer, "The Bible says so", was the final word, the ultimate proof beyond which it was not necessary, nor indeed possible, to go. In our day the Bible has been dethroned. It is, as someone has said, "a fallen oracle". What has happened is that our attitude towards the Bible has changed. We have come to see it as a very human book, containing the failings, the prejudices, and the mistakes of its human authors so that the authoritative word of God which was, for our great-grandparents, so transparently clear on every page is for us either completely hidden or dangerously obscured.

Many factors have contributed to this change but undoubtedly the greatest has been the triumph of the Higher Criticism in biblical studies whereby each book of the Bible is subjected to as strict a literary and historical criticism as any other piece of ancient writing. This discipline has certainly been destructive (the older fundamentalist attitude to the Bible could not survive it), but it has been also constructive in that it made plain the true nature and purpose of the Bible. Hence in our own time there have been many books written on the subject of the authority of the Bible, not only because the dethronement of the Bible in the last century has left a vacuum to be filled but also, and more significantly, because out of biblical criticism has come a new and better answer to the problem.

Each of the four books here reviewed must be studied against this background because each is concerned, in its own way, with the use and interpretation in our own day of the Bible and therefore with this question of authority. Professor Wood's book, *The Interpretation of the Bible*, is an historical introduction to the whole question showing how the Bible has been interpreted down the centuries from the time of our Lord himself. In successive chapters the approach of the Fathers, the Schoolmen, the Reformers, and the Liberals is described, while at the

end of the book there is a fine chapter dealing with contemporary post-critical interpretations. This is an excellent book, which allows us to see our own problem in historical perspective and is to be welcomed not least because it shows plainly that nineteenth century fundamentalism is by no means the normative approach which it sometimes claims to be.

Professor Jessop in *On Reading the English Bible* writes as a layman to help those "for whom the reading of the Bible is a plain duty, but who may find it foreign, difficult, boring or otherwise unrewarding". He discusses the nature of the books that make up the Bible; the problem the language of the Authorized Version sets for the ordinary layman; the use of modern translations; the motives for reading; and finally, he makes suggestions about the order in which the various books ought to be read. Professor Jessop writes clearly, simply, and persuasively, and manages to say a great deal in a little book.

Of *The Study of Old Testament Theology To-day* one can only say that Professor Young is attempting to put the clock back. He writes with considerable learning about the nature, content, and influence of Old Testament theology but the discussion is at every stage vitiated by presuppositions which most readers will find unacceptable. Thus the theology of the Old Testament depends upon the doctrine of the Fall and the truth of this in turn depends upon accepting the story of the garden of Eden as history. Unless Adam lived in history, there can be no Old Testament theology. Again, St Paul's teaching about the person of Christ is dependent upon the same condition because, if there was no historical first Adam, all teaching about Christ as the second Adam is meaningless. While one can sympathize with Professor Young's concern for the authority of the Scriptures, his book provides no help to those who do not share his point of view.

In *The Nature and Authority of the Bible* Mr Abba's purpose is "to gather up, for the educated layman, the chief fruits of twentieth century biblical scholarship". He discusses the problems, questions, and doubts about the Bible that have arisen as a result of critical studies, namely: the various types of literature to be found in the Bible; the distinct and separate purposes of myth, legend, and history; the problem of miracles; and how, and in what sense, the Bible contains a revelation of God. The answers to these problems are given in terms of the discussions of leading biblical theologians of the twentieth century and frequently in their very words (fully a quarter of the book must be quotation). The result is a picture of the nature and authority of the Bible as seen from the point of view of biblical theology. Whether this is the ultimate answer remains to be seen but it is at least a step forwards. Mr Abba has done a useful service in bringing together all this material into one book. It seems doubtful however whether Mr Abba will succeed in his primary purpose of making this a book for the layman. Some knowledge of the technical terms of theology is taken for granted and at least a nodding acquaintance with French, German, Latin, and Greek. Hebrew words are transliterated but one suspects that this is due more to the limitations of the printer than from any concern for those of the readers.

This is surely in such a book, a grave defect. These shortcomings of the book stand out the more in comparison with Professor Jessop's much briefer book which is intended for the same type of reader and is a model of the way in which such a book ought to be written.

J. ROBINSON

ST JOHN'S GOSPEL

STUDIES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL. Edited by F. L. CROSS. Mowbray. 12s. 6d.

THESE studies, which represent lectures given at the Theology and Ministry Conference in 1956, are concerned with the contents of the fourth Gospel, not with its provenance and date; only one deals with its authorship.

Dr C. H. Dodd, with undiminished acumen and clarity, expounds the prologue to show its value for Christian worship in a way which cannot fail to deepen understanding. "To worship God in Christ is not *primarily* to admire His works in nature and history, not even to praise His eternal wisdom and goodness; it is to hear His call and obey his command." That is why theologians have always resorted to Rom. 12. 1-2 as the key text about worship. Dr Dodd uses the prologue to show the relationship and integration of the elements which make true worship. Fr Barnabas Lindars also examines John 1. 1-18 as containing "the whole Gospel in miniature" and shows that the main structure of the work contains material corresponding to that in its prologue. The theme is aptly described as "an act of contemplation", and the treatment has a pleasing freshness.

Professor Kilpatrick's subject is the Gospel's religious background. This is neither Philo nor Gnosticism. The *Hermetica* as a suggested source of influence is chosen for fuller examination. The comparative vocabularies' tests, admittedly incomplete (in fact comprising words of initial letters from *alpha* to *delta*), certainly show that the vocabulary of John is practically identical with that of the Septuagint and has far less in common with the *Hermetica*.

C. J. Barker's essay deals with the contrast between the Johannine literature (excepting the Apocalypse) and the Synoptics in the prominence given to the new birth in the one and to repentance in the other. But this is, I think, more apparent than real. To be *born* anew or from above is plainly a metaphor, though one with actual content. Conversion implies repentance and Christian life constantly requires it. It is not enough to proclaim that God forgives those who repent; genuine repentance is the root difficulty since one cannot repent of what one still loves. Repentance, like the new birth, is from above, as God grants the grace of repentance to those who sin. Mr Barker treats his subject with reference to pastoral experience.

Mr T. H. L. Parker may be complimented on reducing the intolerably verbose Barth's exposition of "the word became flesh" to less than

twelve pages; but a study of a Gospel should expound what it says, not what later theologizing from other sources and in the course of controversies has read into it. Dr Ernest Evans provides an admirable, if tentative and restricted, discussion of John's use of the verb *agapan*. As he notes the use of *philein* in 5. 20, it is a pity he does not discuss it in relation to the use of *agapan* in the closely similar verses 17. 23, 24, 26. Mr Phillips, on Faith and Vision, examines the Gospel's use of *blepein*, *theorein*, *horan*, and *pisteuein*.

My respect for Mr J. N. Sanders' learning and judgement makes it distasteful to have to say that honesty compels me to write that his contribution to this book is unworthy of him. He suggests that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (*egapa*) was Lazarus and that "the other disciple, whom Jesus loved" (*ephilei*) was John Mark, usually regarded as the author of the second Gospel. Mr Sanders suggests that the latter wrote, not that Gospel, but the Johannine Epistles, the Apocalypse, and also edited and published the writings of Lazarus as the fourth Gospel. Mr Sanders admits this to be "highly speculative": to me it is fantastic. He cites nothing that any reasonable person could regard as evidence, and he has (I am sure temporarily) forgotten that nothing is *evidence* that cannot be regarded as more reliable than aspects of a disputed issue which it is invoked to settle.

There is, he says, nothing to strain credulity in that there may have been two Marks in the first century. But neither this, nor the modern Cambridge parallel he cites, is relevant. The question is about *two John* Marks associated with Peter who are never distinguished, and the modern parallel would be if in Cambridge there had been *two Charles* Ravens, *John* Burnabys, and *Owen* Chadwicks whom contemporaries had failed to distinguish. Nor is there *evidence* in the fact that John says, "Jesus loved (*egapa*) Martha and her sister and Lazarus". One could, with as little probability (for it is pure guesswork), claim that the rich young man of the Synoptics was the beloved disciple, because Mark says that Jesus loved him (*egapesen*). He may well have gone away grieved by the condition that he should sell his possessions because he realized he would have to do it and not because he refused the condition; and if he were, as Luke says, a "ruler" one could say he was more likely to be known to the high priest or even related to him (if *gnostos* has that meaning) than was Lazarus; and would even Caiaphas, or anyone in his senses, have wished to destroy one who had raised from the dead a man known and possibly related to him? Similarly the suggestion that Lazarus, having been raised from the dead, could have led to the notion that he was the disciple who "should not die", is not *evidence* but baseless guesswork. Unless it is held that "the Nain widow's only heir did not return from Sheol's lair", his restoration to life could have prompted the notion, which, indeed, can be accounted for on other grounds less speculative. One can acknowledge that if, by any outside chance, Mr Sanders is right, and that the fourth Gospel depends mainly on work of one who had been dead four days, its uniqueness among the world's literature would be indisputably established!

The final essay is by U. E. Simon. He is no doubt right in his point that in the fourth Gospel "Death is not viewed as the natural end to a normal existence but as the enemy in whose clutches is found perdition". The New Testament in general regards death as the baleful and continued result of a primeval transgression. But what would be incredible if it were not fact is that most "biblical theologians" affirm this and completely ignore the unanswerable difficulties it presents to modern man. In so far as "death" means physical death, without it, "Be fruitful and multiply" is demonstrably absurd. For man to-day death has a properly natural aspect, and few aged people have the least wish to push from themselves the ordinance of the Most High. Like every thing that lives, human life buds, blossoms, flowers, fades, and falls, and there is no reason to think there was a Divine intention that it should ever have been otherwise. Nor can such a different view be read out of Genesis. However grievous the consequences of the Fall, nothing suggests that physical death is among them. In the Eden myth the serpent points out, truthfully as the sequel discloses, that the threat of death as the penalty of eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil is an empty one, prompted by not disinterested motives. Adam and Eve do not die: on the contrary, they are driven from the garden lest, having gained knowledge, they should "take of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever". The notion that physical death was a consequence of primeval disobedience is a baseless speculation; but it takes its place among the widespread psychological evidence of the conviction that death could not be the fitting and final end of man. It indicates a groping towards the truth which the Christian doctrine of eternal life brought to light. Mr Simon's positive exposition of John's teaching is sound and useful.

To add to the enormous literature on the fourth Gospel requires justification. Parts of this book do not afford it: others do.

J. S. BEZZANT

REFORMATION QUESTIONS

WHAT OBJECTIONS HAVE BEEN MADE TO ENGLISH ORDERS? By F. E. BRIGHTMAN. 4s. 6d.

THE ELIZABETHAN BISHOPS AND THE CIVIL POWER. 3s.

QUEEN ELIZABETH'S DEFENCE OF HER PROCEEDINGS IN CHURCH AND STATE. By W. E. COLLINS. 5s. 6d.

THE LATER MEDIEVAL DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE. By B. J. KIDD. 9s. 6d.

S.P.C.K., for the Church Historical Society.

ALL acquainted with the publications of the Church Historical Society in its first great period of activity at the turn of the century (now happily rivalled by its more recent reflowering) will rejoice to have available again these reprints of four of its most valuable pamphlets. It

is a measure of their scholarly quality that they are by no means outdated, despite the great developments in historical research and theological thought since they were first issued, in 1896 (4th ed. 1898), 1897, 1899, and 1898 respectively. There was in fact a solidity and quiet dignity about the better type of Anglican apologetic in those days which is too often lacking now.

Brightman's defence of Anglican Orders (originally written before Leo XIII's condemnation of them and only slightly revised afterwards) is written in the precise, dry, and ironic style characteristic of that great scholar and liturgiologist, and it is almost startling to see how little, if at all, it has suffered from time. Indeed, Brightman may almost be said to have anticipated later stages in the perennial controversy; nothing written since invalidates any of his arguments and on at least two points the adversaries have come over to his side. Mgr Barnes's attempt in 1922 to revive the idea that Barlow, Parker's chief consecrator, was never himself consecrated was firmly dealt with in his own Communion, as well as by Dr Claude Jenkins. The contention that in episcopal consecrations co-consecrators are not ministers of the Sacrament of Orders, still popular in Roman schools when Brightman wrote, has been repudiated by an *Apostolic Constitution* of Pius XII in 1944. It may be added that another *Constitution* of 1947 comes down on the side of the traditional Anglican view, maintained by Brightman, that nothing more than prayer and the laying on of hands is necessary for valid ordination.

The second and anonymous pamphlet usefully disposes of the idea that the Elizabethan statute of 1565-6, which declared the legal validity of episcopal consecrations performed since 1559, has anything to do with spiritual validity; only those unfamiliar with the legal subtlety of Henrician bishops (many of whom were primarily lawyers) could suppose that it did, for the difficulty had arisen owing to Bonner's objection to Bishop Horne's legal right to administer the Oath of Supremacy.

Bishop Collins's essay is a valuable account of the Northern Rebellion of 1569, accompanied by a critical edition of the Record Office copy of Elizabeth's manifesto in answer to it, which was possibly never actually put into circulation. He prints also Pius V's brief to the rebel Earls. Here time does perhaps a little "date" the production, for, although Elizabeth's broadside is a good statement of her case, we are more used to the disingenuousness of government propaganda in all ages than was the good Bishop, who, like his contemporaries, had a roseate view of politics; the hardbitten historian may smile to find Collins describing the document as "noble" (p. 33). His enthusiasm is the more odd in that on pp. 27-9 he criticizes Elizabeth's character rather bitterly; no doubt he was influenced by Froude's low estimate of her abilities, which few modern historians would accept.

Best of all the works reprinted is the late Dr Kidd's study of later medieval theology of the eucharistic sacrifice in its relation to Article XXXI on "the sacrifices of masses". One reads it with increasing

admiration for its great author's urbane clarity and learning; reflecting that in this field, where the greatest advances of all since 1898 have been made, Kidd's judgement is so sound and often prophetic. Guided partly by Vacant, he shows the extent to which a doctrine little analysed by the great earlier schoolmen, because it was not attacked, was distorted by some (although by no means all) later medieval theologians under the pressure of popular religion and lack of historical information. A modern treatment of the subject would, of course, have to take into account the great works of de la Taille and such other studies as Iserloh's investigation of the controversy between Luther and his opponents on the Mass. But these more recent researches do not modify substantially Kidd's work. Indeed the whole trend of the thought devoted to the eucharistic sacrifice since he wrote is to reinforce his main contentions, namely that the dislocation of the doctrine which brought about the Protestant rejection of it came chiefly from two mistakes; first an attempt to find in the Mass a self-contained sacrifice, distinct from that of the Cross and offered by the Church rather than by Christ, and secondly (although in its developed form this came later) the consequent effort to find in the Mass a real immolation of Christ, a mistake arising from the historical misconception that immolation was the essence of sacrifice. On this last point both Roman and Anglican theology has made great progress since Kidd wrote—one has only to think of such names as Masure and Hicks—and were he alive to-day to read, for example, the exposition of the Eucharist in Bouyer's *Life and Liturgy*, he would no doubt feel more hopeful still about ultimate reconciliation. In 1898 it was still possible to write: "It is plain that in the prevalent interpretation by the Roman Church of her 'verum et proprium sacrificium', we have surviving to this day a direct legacy from the later medieval doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice" (p. 101). That could not be said to-day. Meanwhile Kidd's calm and scholarly study reminds us how impossible it is to understand either the Anglican formularies or the sixteenth-century situation without a clear notion of both the theology and the popular religion of that age.

THOMAS M. PARKER

A PREACHING MINISTRY

THE PROTESTANT MINISTRY. By DANIEL JENKINS. FABER. 12s 6d.

THIS little book on the Protestant Ministry, written from a Congregationalist point of view is, as one would expect from its author, a very eirenic book. It falls into two halves. The second half consists of three chapters on "The Inner Life of the Minister" which are reprinted, in a slightly revised form, from the author's earlier work *The Gift of Ministry*, which is now out of print, or nearly so. It does not seem necessary to say much here about these three chapters. I myself found the last of them on "Orthodoxy and Heresy" the most interesting and stimulating. The main theme of it is the necessity of "the discipline of

doubt" in the pursuit of the virtue of faith. For the minister, above all, it is necessary that he acquire "certitude", i.e. personal experienced apprehension of religious truth, rather than that he rely upon the "security" of tradition and orthodox doctrine received only from the experience of others. This chapter also contains a very interesting comparison of Donne with Milton, much in favour of the former.

The first part of the book consists of five lectures given in America on "The Protestant Ministry To-day". In the last two of them it does not seem to me that the author has anything very important and new to say. But I found the first three extremely interesting, especially the opening one on "The Ministry as the Ecumenical Problem". This raises the problem why it is that the Ministry or "Order" occupies such a predominant place in all ecumenical discussions, and, whilst not denying that this is inevitable, warns of the difficulty of distinguishing with certainty between what is defended and insisted upon because it really is a part of the Gospel and of Christ's will for his church, and what is defended from prejudice and because of vested interests.

The second and third chapters describe the function of the Ministry in Protestantism and episcopacy as seen through Protestant eyes. These two chapters, in my opinion, would form a most excellent basis of discussion between Anglicans and non-episcopalians at, say, the parochial level. If an incumbent with his P.C.C. were to sit down with the minister and his committee and go over these two chapters to discover how far they agreed and how far and why they disagreed, it would, I think, prove a most fruitful discussion and be the cause of much mutual understanding and sympathy.

Were I myself taking part in such a discussion there are two points which I should wish at once to raise. First, that there is an obvious need for both sides to define more carefully and accurately what they mean by the word "apostolic" in such phrases as "apostolic succession" and "the Church, the apostolic community". Secondly, all the Protestant churches claim, and I do not for one moment doubt the sincerity of the claim, that their ministries are ministries of the Word and Sacraments. Yet it seems that in fact, in the exercise of the ministry, the Sacraments play a very small part. In this book, for example, you can hardly turn a single page without finding something about some aspect of preaching. Indeed the book is a book about the Ministry of the Word. There is no treatment of the Ministry of the Sacraments at all. Can it be, surely not, that the Protestant ministry is in fact a Ministry of the Word only, as the furnishing of their churches would suggest? Is it not, perhaps, true that just as Anglicans need, on the whole, to recover a greater awareness of the importance and difficulty of the Ministry of the Word, so also for their part the non-episcopalians need to recover a greater awareness of the place in the life of the Church of the Ministry of the Sacraments?

I hope that this little book will be widely read by Anglicans. It is written with great charity and has much in it over which Anglicans may well ponder in self-criticism.

✠ ROBERT EXON :

RESTORATION KIRK

BISHOP AND PRESBYTERY THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, 1661-1688. By WALTER ROLAND FOSTER. S.P.C.K. 25s.

"AFTER the Restoration Episcopacy was re-established, and a bitter and bloody struggle between Scottish Episcopalians and Presbyterians ensued. At the Revolution the Church of Scotland became Presbyterian once more (1690) and has remained so ever since." So *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* concisely summarizes the period with which Mr Foster's book is concerned. But no mere summary can do justice to the highly complicated situation in Scotland which Mr Foster, after diligent research, expounds with admirable skill and impartiality.

The Restoration was certainly welcomed by a very large proportion of Scotsmen; Presbyterianism had been discredited by its internal divisions, and Robert Douglas, an important Presbyterian leader, speaks of the "heart-hatred" which the new generation bore to the Covenant. "The whole political and ecclesiastical trend", writes Mr Foster, "was to re-establish the pattern of government known in the days of James VI". And this included the restoration of "right government by bishops". Mr Foster estimates that two-hundred-and-fifty—three-hundred clergymen out of nine-hundred refused to conform; and there were local military insurrections by Covenanters in 1666 and 1679, the latter being prefaced by the murder of Archbishop Sharp of St Andrews. Its defeat put an end to these troubles; and there was no question of large-scale rebellion till James VII (II) raised the issue of Popery. "The Restoration Church was making an attempt to combine presbyterian and episcopal elements into one religious settlement".

This attempt is of immense intrinsic interest, and directly relevant to the question of Anglo-Presbyterian relations to-day. The supposedly novel idea of a "Bishop in Presbytery" was then a working system, and remarkably free from friction. The Presbyterian set-up continued after the Restoration, but was now integrated with the Episcopate. From the Catholic point of view there were indeed many defects and anomalies; thus, though ordinations were reserved to the bishops, men were ordained simply to "the ministry"; and there was little reordination of ministers ordained by the Presbyterians. There was no official liturgy or Prayer Book; there is no evidence of the practice of Confirmation; and the Eucharist was celebrated very seldom. In the parishes there were very few changes; the churches were poor and meanly furnished; there were "no Ceremonies, Surplice, Altars, Cross in Baptisms", and almost the only departure from Presbyterian ways was the introduction of the Doxology, the Lord's Prayer, and, in Baptism, the Creed. Bishop Leighton—who appears frequently and attractively in these pages—with others, tried to make the public worship more worshipful; e.g. he warns his people against "their most indecent sitting at prayer".

A short review must needs omit much of what Mr Foster has to tell us, frequently to our discomfort, but always to our profit if we desire

to know the truth. And he leaves us with the hopeful reflection that the Scottish Church in this period "can serve to remind us once again of the adaptability of the episcopal office and its capacity to function under the most varied of circumstances".

✠ ERIC GRAHAM

NATIONAL HOMILETICS

THE PAUL'S CROSS SERMONS. By MILLAR MACLURE. University of Toronto Press; London: Oxford University Press. 45s.

THE ASSOCIATE Professor of English at Toronto has given us a comprehensive and detailed study of the sermons preached at St Paul's Cross in London between 1534 and 1642. The volume is a monument both to the author's learning and to the importance of the subject. From Henry VIII's Act of Supremacy to the opening of the Civil War, during all the religious, social, and political vicissitudes of the time, the open-air pulpit at St Paul's was the chief centre of government propaganda.

Although it was the Bishop of London's "chaire", the chief Ministers of State would from time to time intervene to give precise instructions as to the line that was to be followed in the exhortation. Occasionally a Puritan preacher would take the bit between his teeth and bolt down some side-path of individualist theology. Nevertheless, in the large and by the instructions remained nationalist, and because they were nationalist became Anglican. In fact it might be said that St Paul's Cross performed a major function in developing and fixing a popular Anglicanism as distinct from the Anglicanism of the theologians.

The Professor approaches his subject from four angles in four distinct sections of his book, antiquarian, historical, sociological, and homiletic. As can be imagined, one gets by this means a good all-round view of the subject, but the short "conclusion" in which he sums up his findings is quite invaluable. There follows a section devoted to some detailed notes. (Here on an odd occasion one lifts an eyebrow at what the author deems "scholarly and authoritative".) Perhaps most valuable of all to the earnest student is a section of seventy-three pages giving a register and short précis of the sermons delivered at the Cross during the period mentioned.

The volume should become the indispensable companion of everyone setting out upon the study of what the author calls "the most revolutionary of all the reformations".

W. W.

COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY

RELIGIONS: A PRELIMINARY HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL STUDY. By D. W. GUNDRY. MacMillan. 16s.

THERE is no lack of books on the history and comparative study of religion, but while most of them have been written either objectively

from the scientific or historical standpoint, or theologically to vindicate some particular faith, system, or position, this volume combines both methods of approach to the subject. Thus, Mr Gundry contends that "there can be no such thing as an absolute impartiality where vital matters are concerned", and so he has adopted a quite openly Christian approach to the elucidation of "comparative theology" (to employ his own description of the discipline), addressed to "theological and other students, the clergy, teachers, and their advanced pupils, as well as the educated layman". Nevertheless, he agrees that "sympathy with the sincere beliefs of others there must be". Therefore, he has endeavoured to describe the salient features of the religions of mankind everywhere, and at all times fairly, accurately, and as clearly as possible in a manner intelligible to the non-specialist. That he may be said to have succeeded in this very exacting task in less than 200 pages is no small achievement.

Having lectured on the History of Religions at the University College of North Wales for a number of years, he has plenty of material at his disposal for a general review of the entire field, beginning with the various theories of the origin of religion, and the religious quest of the ancient civilizations in the Near East and the Graeco-Roman world, with a side glance at Shinto and primitive cults. Taoism, Confucianism, Hinduism, and Buddhism are next briefly considered under the not very accurate heading of "Monistic Religions", leading up to Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Islam, and Christianity. Since it is steadfastly maintained that of all these Christianity "is the most to be reckoned with", its Founder presenting to each and all "a personal problem on which he cannot escape decision", the twenty pages devoted to this all-important aspect of the subject, together with a number of highly controversial theological questions, are far too few to be adequate. But as "a preliminary historical and theological study of the religions of the world" the volume is to be commended unreservedly to the readers for whom it is intended.

E. O. JAMES

RECENT PLATONISM

PLATONISM IN RECENT RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. By WILLIAM D. GEOGHEGAN. Columbia University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 32s.

A READER who is in search of pure undiluted metaphysics is likely to find what he is looking for here. The author has had the promising idea of discussing the Christian Platonism of W. R. Inge, Paul Elmer More, A. E. Taylor, and William Temple; and Platonic Themes in A. N. Whitehead and George Santayana. He has very thoroughly explored a portion of this field—strictly limited to metaphysics. You would gather from his book that Plato was almost entirely concerned with metaphysics, and that religion matters mainly because of what it contributes to metaphysics. A reader who was not familiar with Plato might not be much handicapped, but he would not get any notion of what the

Dialogues are like. A reader not well acquainted with Christianity would get no notion of what Christianity is. He might not even learn what Platonism is, because the treatment of the Platonists except these six is scanty, while on the other hand any extract from Plato is reckoned Platonic, a precarious supposition about an author of such moods and miscellaneous interests. Nor is it wholly satisfactory in a work on *recent* religious thought to deal professedly with just six authors, of whom all but William Temple were born in the sixties of the last century.

Nevertheless this is an impressive book. Granted the use of the correct metaphysical vocabulary to its full extent, the style is lucid. The works of the chosen six have been ransacked for significant passages and their arguments carefully stated and magisterially criticized. They are all made to appear somewhat defective and rather contradictory, at any rate as metaphysicians. But although Dr Geoghegan is hard on them he is not unfair. Like William Temple's father, he is a beast, but he is a just beast. He might in places have made it easier to be certain whether he is summarizing other people's views or giving his own.

It is perhaps only a personal slant that will give rise in some minds to a feeling of regret that it does not appear from these pages that these six writers were something more than metaphysicians. We get no inkling of Inge's charming style. Taylor's enthusiasm, or Santayana's idiosyncratic outlook. But that, Dr Geoghegan would say, is quite irrelevant; for he means business, and down he gets to it. The result is remarkable, and, when you are used to it, attractive.

ADAM FOX

CAMBRIDGE REFORMERS

REFORMATION AND REACTION IN TUDOR CAMBRIDGE. By H. C. PORTER.
Cambridge University Press. 52s. 6d.

WHEN one considers that the English Reformation was conceived, born, and nurtured in Cambridge, it is surprising that no real attempt has been made hitherto to trace its course in the university itself. In one way this is fortunate, for the theme awaited the man and has now found a predestined author. Ideally fitted for his task, Dr Porter is a competent historian who understands theology, a lover of his university and a man who has savoured academic life. To those merits he adds objectivity, a sense of style, and quiet humour. The result is a fascinating book, both learned and readable, which sheds light upon many matters not heretofore brought into relation with each other.

His survey (which suffers a little from lack of clear chronological and topical arrangement) extends over the whole sixteenth century and well into the seventeenth. The first four chapters depict the Cambridge created by John Fisher, and go on to deal with the events and personages which ironically made it the home of the Protestantism Fisher saw as the great danger of his times. Except in detail there is little added here

to what was already known of that spread of Continental Protestantism which produced Cranmer and the other great Cambridge Reformers and brought it about that no less than a fifth of the Marian exiles were Cambridge men. It is in the second and third parts of his book, which deal respectively with the struggle between Puritanism and Anglican authority and the controversies about the theology of grace in later sixteenth-century Cambridge, that Dr Porter becomes most interesting. He shows clearly the relationship between both these tussles and the constitutional history of the university. As might be expected, the internal politics of colleges were much exacerbated by religious disputes; equally, militant Puritanism made acute the problem of doctrinal authority in the university as a whole. The Cambridge Heads of colleges, who acquired greater powers by the new statutes of 1570, exercised them very often in the same arbitrary way as the Oxford Heads, three centuries later, were to do in the days of the Oxford Movement. It is curious to reflect that the former gained their powers largely in order to control a movement led by young dons, the latter lost theirs in 1854 partly because of their failure to deal justly with a similar movement.

Of more general interest is the story of the conflicts over the Calvinist doctrines of absolute predestination, indefectible grace, and assurance, which forms the third section of Dr Porter's book. He makes it clear that what is commonly called the English Arminian movement was primarily an indigenous growth and owed little to the Dutch controversy. As he says, the issues debated at Dort in 1618 "were those which had been debated in Cambridge in the late 1590s and which had been causing argument in the Church of England since the early 1580s" (p. 409). Strict Calvinism was by no means unchallenged, even in Cambridge, in Elizabeth's reign, as has too often been supposed. Dr Porter, in a careful analysis of the sermons and writings of such Calvinist champions as William Perkins and of their opponents, William Barrett, Peter Baro, Lancelot Andrewes, and John Overall, discusses the storm centres of controversy, the relation of predestination to God's foreknowledge of sin, the irresistibility of grace, and the legitimacy of personal assurance of election. Seen in this broad aspect the Cambridge controversies take their place in the general disputes about grace which agitated all parts of Western Christendom, Catholic and Protestant alike, at the time. Were it not that the West, as the Pelagian controversies and their aftermaths show, has always found a peculiar fascination in the justification of the ways of God to man, one might imagine that the development of mathematics had something to do with this itch to rend the veil of mystery which must always surround these subjects. (Erasmus noted the appearance of Cambridge mathematics in his day (pp. 36-7); the connections of mathematics and Jansenism are well known.) Even more puzzling is the strange attraction for genuinely religious minds of restricted views of divine mercy and of a thirst for personal certainty of salvation which, paradoxically, accompanied this, a thirst which might seem to imperil both the virtue of trust and the creaturely sense of dependence. Yet both Calvinists and Jansenistically

inclined Catholics were zealots for doctrine of this kind and accompanied it in practice with a self-conscious moral fervour which would go more naturally with an extreme doctrine of justification by works. The pious mind in all ages presents strange paradoxes. What is cheering to realize, as one closes this book, is that much of the English Church, by the end of the sixteenth century, was shaking off the bonds of rigid transcendentalism and distrust of natural reason. Whatever their limitations, both Cambridge High Churchmen like Andrewes and Cambridge Platonists like Whichcote were nearer to the serene balance of thirteenth-century theology than to the sincere but fanatical systems of the later Middle Ages and the Reformation.

THOMAS M. PARKER

RETREAT MEDITATIONS

DARKNESS NO DARKNESS. By RAYMOND RAYNES, C.R. Faith Press. 6s.

FR RAYNES has here left us, one can truly say, as his dying gift, a most helpful and apt book. It is a set of retreat meditations. They are designed for use either together in one retreat, or one by one in daily meditations, or for periodical days of retreat.

Such is the despiritualizing rush and scramble of our day that the call to quiet and prayer cannot be sounded too often. For those who realize the need and value of "times of refreshing from the Presence of the Lord" here is most useful guidance. In these fifteen brief addresses the late Superior of Mirfield gives us fruits from his own wide experience and deep spiritual life. The language throughout is refreshingly simple, practical, and direct.

Fr Raynes' choice of title illustrates the purpose of the book and is indicative of his whole personality. If ever one could "smite the rocks for living fountains" it was he. Here he points the way to help others to share his own readiness to cope with difficulties and find happiness in the toils of the Christian warfare. "We shall all have to bear spiritual suffering if we are truly to follow our Lord. It is a very real part of prayer, and we have to learn to say, 'O darkness, bless the Lord', as well as 'O Light, bless the Lord'; and we must say both with conviction." The deepest matters of the spiritual life are presented in the most simple words; but anyone reading the book carefully would soon realize that there is far more here than might appear at first sight.

T. L. MANSON, S.S.J.E.

CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD

MINISTRY AND PRIESTHOOD, CHRIST'S AND OURS. By T. W. MANSON. Epworth. 6s. 6d.

THIS book consists of two admirable lectures. The first, entitled "Some Aspects of the Ministry of Jesus and the Task of his Church", examines

our Lord's work under three headings, Jesus the Teacher, Christ the Conqueror, and Christ the Sacrifice; and then sets out what the Church's task is in continuing these three aspects of Christ's ministry.

The second lecture on "The Priesthood of Believers" is a scholarly contribution to the ecumenical discussion on the ministry. After a brief survey of the use of the phrase "the priesthood of believers" in the great reformers and of the word "priest" in the early Fathers, most of this lecture is devoted to an examination of the New Testament evidence. The teaching of the Pauline epistles and of the Apocalypse on the sacrifice of Christ and the implications of our Lord's words at the Last Supper lead naturally to the conception of Christ our great high-priest in the epistle to the Hebrews, which must always be "of primary importance for our understanding of the meaning of priesthood in the Christian dispensation" (p. 48). It is there stated that, although the sacrificial act on Calvary was unique and "once for all", yet Christ remains "priest for ever", and the essence of his sacrifice is "his complete self-dedication in unreserved obedience to God his Father and in unlimited love and compassion toward men his brethren" (p. 63).

Indisputably 1 Peter and the Apocalypse, taking up allusions in the Pauline epistles, teach that all believers form a royal priesthood. It is important to be as clear as possible of what this consists: "the priesthood of all believers lies in the fact that each believer offers himself as a sacrifice according to the pattern laid down by Christ and—what is equally essential—that all these individual offerings are taken up into the one perpetual offering made by the one eternal high-priest of the new covenant" (p. 64).

Dr Manson, quoting early Fathers, stated, "the focus of this high-priestly work, in which Christ and his people share, is the sacrament of the eucharist" (p. 70). He also granted, on the strength of 1 Cor. 12. 27-30 and Eph. 4. 11-12, that "the Church has a ministry appointed by God from earliest days", and that this is not inconsistent with "the priesthood of all believers".

To all this an Anglican would say "Amen". But two things more must be said. The present ministry of any Christian communion needs some guarantee that it retains the authority of the first ministry "appointed by God". Also there needs to be stated the exact function of the ministry in relation to the eucharist, the focus of the high-priestly work of Christ and his Church. These two requirements are met in the historic episcopate and the statements of the ordinal for the Anglican Church: and it would presumably require some similar guarantees in any body of Christians with whom it entered into full communion.

Therefore we should regretfully have to deem inadequate Dr Manson's conclusion, "Let that be deemed a valid eucharist in which Christ carries on the high-priestly task which is his alone" (p. 71); and, "Apart from the eternal high-priesthood of Christ, no ministry is essential to the Church in the sense that the Church could not exist without it . . . The test is pragmatic: By their fruits ye shall know them". Incidentally, what on these grounds should we have to say about the Society of

Friends with their abundant fruits of the Spirit and no ministry?

There has been careful proof-reading of a multitude of references: but Apoc. 1. 10 on page 51 should read 5. 10.

S. M. GIBBARD, S.S.J.E.

ADDITIONAL SAYINGS OF JESUS ?

UNKNOWN SAYINGS OF JESUS. By JOACHIM JEREMIAS, translated by R. H. FULLER. S.P.C.K. 10s.

FEW except scholars know that there are many sayings attributed to Jesus which are not found in the Gospels. They are generally called *agrapha*, but they exist in writing. Alfred Resch in 1889 made available such as were then known, and his collection was critically sifted by J. H. Ropes a few years later. Professor Jeremias' *Unbekannte Jesus-worte* (2nd ed. 1951) is now made available in English.

In 1 Corinthians there are three references to sayings of Jesus which have close parallels in Mark or Matthew. There are others—in Acts 20. 35, 1 Thess. 4. 16f (which may be independent of Matt. 24. 30f), while Rom. 14. 14 is probably only an elucidation of the meaning of Mark 7. 15; others appear in very few MSS of the New Testament, but not in the best, most of them clearly being interpolations; others are found in early Christian writers, in apocryphal and heretical writings, and in the papyri. Jeremias rejects as not genuine six of those which Ropes (originally fourteen in number, though he later reduced them to ten) accepted as valuable; and disregards those found in the Infancy gospels and some other apocryphal literature, and also the Mohammedan *agrapha* cited by Ropes in his article in the Extra Volume of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. In his Appendix he discusses an interesting one in Arabic found on the gateway of a mosque at Fatehpur-Sikri, south of Delhi, but does not accept it as genuine; though in his Addenda he says that Jesus' authorship is "so firmly established that nothing could disprove it". One could equally well say that it is so late as to provide neither proof nor probability that it is genuine. He also considers sayings found since 1889 in papyri and other literary discoveries. Altogether the total is over one hundred, a "mixed bag of tares and wheat, more tares than wheat", as he temperately describes them.

Jeremias therefore eliminates alleged dominical sayings which are tendentious inventions or modifications, the purpose of which was to support heretical teaching; such as are probably erroneous memory-quotations from the Gospel; those whose subject-matter is suspicious; and others, not open to that objection, but whose attestation he considers too late to be reliable.

He estimates the number with claim to be genuine at twenty-one. These are printed in English and in their original languages. They are also expounded exegetically and objections to their genuineness are examined. This is done, as is inevitable in any work by Jeremias, with ingenuity and, in footnote references, great learning. But here, I think,

learning, like mercy, rejoices against judgement. To my mind, the exegesis is sometimes forced and eked out by unsupported possibilities. Professor Jeremias could hardly have known more about the man working on the Sabbath (found in *Codex Bezae* in place of Luke 6. 5) had he been present at the alleged scene. He claims that his twenty-one selected *agrapha* "have as high a claim to authenticity as the sayings recorded in our four Gospels . . . Indeed, many of these twenty-one sayings possess an even higher historical value than for instance many of the sayings attributed to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel." This, to put it mildly, is large exaggeration; while as for the claim that these *agrapha* "will give the ordinary reader some idea of the impact of our Lord's words on those who heard them for the first time", I cannot conceive them having that result if the words of Jesus recorded in the Gospels do not.

At the date of the beginnings of the Christian Church there must have been at least hundreds of persons who had heard something of Jesus' controversies, sayings, and teaching. There is therefore, initially, nothing improbable if not all of these recollections were available in the sources, oral or written, used by the canonical evangelists. But it is equally highly improbable that many or any would have come to light in a *reliable form* after the date of the latest Gospel. Few of Professor Jeremias' ingenious speculations which help to convince him of the genuineness of his twenty-one *agrapha* can count for much in answering (as distinct from replying to) objections to it based on facts and common probabilities. To show that an *agraphon* suggests a Jewish-Christian origin or that Jesus could have uttered it, is not evidence that it was spoken by Jesus: to great teachers sayings are always later attributed erroneously if without dishonesty. The earliest appearance of all these sayings is of too late a date to be reliable evidence, and their patristic attestation is weak; while if they had been known and accepted as the Lord's in any important church-area, they would have been likely to have found their way into the Gospels before the dates of the earliest and best surviving MSS.

This book is of great interest, but of much less importance. It fills a gap in that it provides access to the only *agrapha* with any claim to be even considered as possibly genuine in a convenient form for theological students and others, and at a commendably modest price. With the facts and Professor Jeremias' argued judgements before them readers, without great learning, can form their own judgements. They will be well advised to do so.

J. S. BEZZANT

“QUESTIONABLE ECCENTRIC”

ABBOT EXTRAORDINARY. By PETER F. ANSON. Faith Press. 25s.

THE author was a monk at Caldey when Aelred Carlyle was Abbot. This exciting biography gives a vivid picture of a truly extraordinary

character. He was, as Dame Rose Macaulay remarks in a Foreword, a "charming and questionable eccentric", quite irresponsible in money matters and with utterly unrealistically lavish ideas. Yet he had an astonishing gift for influencing young men and worked unsparingly for the underworld. When the Caldey Benedictines seceded to Rome, the authorities were far too hasty in making Aelred Abbot. Indeed, throughout his career he was treated in an almost unprecedented way. Aelred Abbot he was pretty nearly a free-lance. When serious troubles ensued, he was reduced to the status of a simple priest. After years of remarkable work in British Columbia, where he was given the Freedom of the City of Vancouver, he returned to Prinknash. At his funeral a mitre and crozier were laid on the pall.

The only point on which many are likely to differ from Mr Anson is his assessment of the late Lord Halifax. He was certainly an idealist, but hardly a "fifth-columnist" working for Rome, or an "incurable romantic" living in a dream-world of his own creation.

FREDERIC HOOD

LYMAN MACCALLUM

CALL TO ISTANBUL. By CONSTANCE PADWICK. Longmans. 16s. 6d.

THIS is an exciting biography. First, because it reveals to what heights the life of the "ordinary" Christian can reach. We are told in the Introduction that Lyman MacCallum was a man whose "career was to outward seeming uneventful, who made no direct mark on scholarship or politics or literature". Yet it was a life full of rich human contacts and fruitful work.

It is an exciting book for a second reason. Turkey was the centre of MacCallum's work, and Istanbul his home. Most of us know a certain amount about the politics and cultures of various Muslim countries. We may often wish, however, that we knew more about Muslims as *persons*. Through MacCallum's many friendships we meet Turks, and others, as friends.

Lyman MacCallum was born in Anatolia, where his parents were missionaries. In 1907 he went home to Canada for his education and trained as an engineer. He served in the First World War in the Canadian Engineers. His life, however, was guided into a different path and, for reasons which the reader will discover, he became agent of the American Bible Society in charge of the work in Istanbul. He continued in this service in ever more responsible spheres until he died, in 1955. This biography gives interesting descriptions of the activities of the Bible Society in that wide area of which Turkey is only the centre.

K. H. HENREY

ISLAM

MUHAMMAD AND THE ISLAMIC TRADITION. By EMILE DERMENGHEM, translated by JEAN WATT. Longmans. 6s.

THIS beautifully produced and illustrated little book will provide a useful introduction to a knowledge of the history of Islam, the life of its founder, and the development of various aspects of the Islamic tradition. It contains also translations of extracts from the *Qur'an* and from various classical writers. Because such a vast subject is covered in a relatively small space, the interested reader will wish to refer to more detailed accounts in order to find further information. A very full bibliography is appended.

K. H. HENREY

FAILURE OF THE STATE

THE COMING WORLD CIVILIZATION. By WILLIAM ERNEST HOCKING. Allen and Unwin. 16s

WHEN the average Englishman thinks of the "typical American", he thinks of someone who is essentially adolescent—brash, generous, opinionated, sensitive, conventional, cynical, inexperienced, sentimental. But to suppose this to be true of all Americans is totally to disregard the Yankee New Englander—whose spiritual home, if not his geographical one, is the Eastern Seaboard. He is frequently wise, disillusioned, liberal-minded, courageous—essentially a mature person—and he has made an immense contribution to his nation's stock-pile of character and accomplishment.

Dr Hocking is such a man, and his book, as a result, has a quality of maturity that is more than the distillation of his wide reading and equally wide experience. It is a hopeful book, thoughtful and tolerant, a book in which the Christian case is not stated with the desperate defiance of retreat but as a challenge before ramparts long regarded as the inviolable citadel of materialism.

For it begins with a statement as to the "impotence of the State" in most of those fields—law, education, economics, recreation, family life—which it has come to regard as its own preserve. This impotence arises from "a failure of the motivation it has hitherto been able to assume in its public". In other words, the State cannot ultimately succeed except in so far as it achieves the purpose of its individual members—an unconscious but effective "Social Contract". Now advancing civilization has so increased our mental subjectivity, our absorption in the self, that we have become a world of Hamlets losing "the very name of action". Philosophically denying the validity of any knowledge or experience other than that which can be perceived by the self, or recorded by those technical sciences available to the self, we become incapable of that intelligent corporate action which alone can save us.

To meet this need, Dr Hocking urges the importance of the two great Christian commandments. To love God is, he believes, to look again for that mystical experience and insight common to all the great faiths and so already capable of a world unity. At the same time, to love one's neighbour is to accept "involvement", our inescapable responsibility for one another. And this leads to "the will to create through suffering" the "faith in fact", which is expressed in the drive of experience, the travail of the mother, the labour of the settler.

I do not know whether the writer is himself a member of the Society of Friends, but his book is within the great tradition of their Society, in its longing for a faith that is free from institutions, and so at home everywhere, and in its real love for humankind, "where move in strange democracy the million masks of God".

STEPHAN HOPKINSON

HAPPY MARRIAGE

THE PATTERN OF LOVE. By WILLIAM WYLIE. Longmans. 16s.

ANY stockbreeder describing this quite admirable book would nod approvingly over its admitted ancestry in the strain that has produced Charles Williams, C. S. Lewis, and that less celebrated outsider, Denis de Rougemont. It is a strain that gives plenty of theological staying power, with a burst of romantic speed when called upon. And such a combination is in effect the subject of this particular example of the breed—for it maintains and most capably defends the essential unity which underlies the supposed opposition between our modern versions of Sacred and Profane Love, of romantic devotion and Christian conversion.

The marriage doctrine of the Church is, as Mr Wylie rightly and bravely says, an ungracious and arid one—or was until the last Lambeth Report emended it. Because of this the Church's attitude to sex (and perhaps to unsuccessful marriage) has also been arid and ungracious. It is the singular merit of this book that without yielding an inch from the orthodox defence of marriage as permanent and indissoluble it offers explanations of many of its difficulties together with help in meeting them. Honest to admit that many post-divorce marriages have all the outward signs of happiness, and that, to quote a "despairing" Moral Welfare Worker, "they are now living in a state of happy sin", it turns even such cases into evidence in support of its main thesis, that the "Romantic Love" with which the materialist world is absorbed is in fact akin to genuine religious experience. This is a book of immense help to all clergy who are concerned about the matter of marriage preparation and would make an admirable wedding present for any intelligent young couple.

STEPHAN HOPKINSON

ADDITIONAL PRAYERS

THE UNFOLDING YEAR. By FRANCIS L. WHEELER. Faith Press. 10s. 6d.

IT is almost inevitable that books of devotion should be introduced, as Mr Wheeler introduces his, with such a sentence as: "It might be thought unnecessary to add to the many manuals of prayer already in existence." Their justification must be found in their supplying material in a convenient form for a particular group of people, or for some special occasions. *The Unfolding Year* is offered for use primarily "after the Third Collect" and at non-liturgical services.

The distinctive character of the book is due to its drawing upon the historic liturgies, Eastern and Western, for material appropriate to the seasons of "the unfolding year". Collects, antiphons, and other formulas have been brought into use, the compiler adapting these to his own purpose, often by arranging congregational responses to prayers said by the priest. The general arrangement is practical, though not all the forms could be used without copies of the book being in the hands of the people. The book is fortunately free from the oddities of expression and over-literalness which too often disfigure translations from ancient liturgies.

Additional material is provided for more general use through the year, including an excellent short litany under the title "A General Intercession".

H. RILEY

TRAINING THE PREACHER

ROYAL SACRAMENT: THE PREACHER AND HIS MESSAGE. By R. A. WARD. Marshall, Morgan and Scott. 12s. 6d.

IN a recent book Bishop Barry writes with characteristic candour a footnote to one section: "Any reader who finds the details boring could skip this section without much loss to the argument."

I felt this footnote could well apply to certain chapters of Dr Ward's book. In a foreword the Bishop of Bradford states that the author's style reminds him of T. R. Glover's—and is eminently readable. But it was not until I got as far as Chapter 4, "The Preacher and his General Literature", that I caught a glimpse of what his style was like. Till then every page teems with quotations and references in paralysing procession. I remembered the author's comment in the preface that "documentation is indeed almost an instinct to one who has spent years teaching in a theological college" and again, "books are the tools of the preacher's trade. They are not to be paraded in the pulpit all the time—a carpenter need not brandish a saw every time he displays a table he has made"—but nevertheless Dr Ward has given the reader a complete and indexed catalogue of the tools used. Had this been done not in the text but in

footnotes—after rigorous pruning—the style would have flowed and the reader been stimulated.

I enjoyed the chapter on “The Preacher and the Fellowship”—though I hoped that it was with fussy ordinands and not normal parish priests in mind that the author goes to some length to explain how the *Magnificat* is a suitable expression of the worship of men as well as women!

Theological college principals will rightly assess the merits of the last chapter “The Training of the Preacher”. But at the end I was left wondering exactly what type of reader the author had “looking over his shoulder” when he wrote this book. Ordinands yes.—But who else?

GEORGE REINDORP

IN PRAISE OF PEAKE

ARTHUR SAMUEL PEAKE (1865-1929): ESSAYS IN COMMEMORATION. Edited by JOHN T. WILKINSON. Epworth. 21s.

TO MARK the twenty-fifth anniversary of the death of Professor A. S. Peake, his former students resolved to establish a Memorial Lecture and to publish the present series of Essays with characteristic selections from his writings. In a biographical note we learn that Peake entered St John's College, Oxford, as a scholar in 1885, took a first in theology, became a fellow of Merton and lecturer at Mansfield College. While at Oxford he came under the influence of Cheyne, Driver, Sanday, Fairbairn, and Hatch who, among other things, helped him to lay the foundations of the historical approach to biblical study. Peake was a Primitive Methodist, and in response to the call of his own Communion he accepted an appointment at Hartley College, Manchester—the training college for those entering the Primitive Methodist ministry. For thirty-seven years he served the College with tireless energy and moulded the intellectual outlook of generations of students. He was also the prime agent in the formation of the Faculty of Theology in the University of Manchester, where he was appointed Rylands Professor.

These interesting and attractive Essays are written by old students and friends. The former Principal of Hartley (now Hartley-Victoria) College—Dr H. G. Meecham—opens with an assessment of Peake's character and achievements; Dr W. F. Lofthouse writes on Oxford days; Professor T. W. Manson, since deceased, indicates his contribution to the life of the University of Manchester and particularly its theological faculty; Dr Victor Murray describes his work as author and editor, and the present Principal of Peake's old College in Manchester (the Reverend J. T. Wilkinson) reviews his rôle as an Ecumenical Churchman. This volume constitutes a worthy tribute to a biblical scholar who rendered a unique and timely contribution to the interpretation of the Bible in the light of modern knowledge. In spite of an unusually wide equipment, it cannot be said that he left behind him a *magnum opus*. His

commentaries, books, and the articles which he wrote for the one-volume Bible commentary by which he will be best remembered are of high quality but of necessity they are somewhat restricted in content and treatment. Had he lived, it is possible that he might have completed a history of the religion of Israel and written the projected Commentary on Isaiah 40-66 (I.C.C.). But Peake, we gather, was not as concerned as some of his friends that he should make outstanding contributions to biblical scholarship. It was his ambition to be "a guide to biblical study" (the title of his first book) to the non-specialist and to show how biblical criticism was indispensable for the religious understanding of the Scriptures. In any final estimate, we may recall the remark of Professor F. C. Burkitt, quoted in one of the Essays, that it was largely due to Peake's work and influence that this country had been spared the odium of a public Fundamentalist controversy. This tribute stands even if the victory for the unfettered approach to the Bible is not yet complete

HAROLD ROBERTS

THE GREEK TEXT

THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT. Second Edition with Revised Critical Apparatus. The British and Foreign Bible Society. 8s. 6d.

THE British and Foreign Bible Society took an important step when, to commemorate its centenary in 1904, it abandoned the Received Text and adopted by permission the text of the Württemberg Bible Society's fourth edition of the Greek Testament (1904) under the care of its editor Dr Eberhard Nestlé. The newly adopted text was a great improvement on the late and inferior text hitherto published by the Society. It was the result of a collation of the texts of three notable editions of the Greek Testament in the latter part of the nineteenth century: those of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and Bernhard Weiss. In producing this Text Dr Nestlé usually followed the first two, and where they differed that which agreed with Weiss. Nevertheless, the 1904 edition laboured under the great disadvantage, compared with other Greek Testaments, in having an apparatus which supplied no manuscript evidence for the variant readings cited in it. The purpose of the apparatus was to indicate "every variation of any importance in the resultant text above it, in words, spelling or punctuation, from (1) the *Textus Receptus*, and (2) the Greek Text which avowedly or inferentially underlies the English Revised Version of 1881".

Half a century later the Society decided to issue a second edition in connection with its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary. The task was entrusted to Dr Erwin Nestlé, the eminent son of the scholar who gave his name to the widely used editions of the Greek Testament published by the Württemberg Bible Society at intervals since 1898, and to Professor G. D. Kilpatrick of Oxford, one of the leading textual critics of the day, as editors. While the text remains virtually unchanged, the apparatus is

quite new and constructed on different principles from that of the first edition. It "is intended to give a selection of the important variant readings including all readings of moment which may be original, those which are characteristic of the main types of text (such as the Western text), and other readings of special interest" (Introduction, p. viii). This apparatus is vastly superior to the selective one in Souter's edition. To give one example at random, in John 6. 1-11 Souter only notes an omission in verse 4, while this new apparatus provides seven additional variants within these verses. The work of many scholars has contributed to the construction of the apparatus, which incorporates the latest knowledge of the papyri (including the recently published *Bodmer Papyrus* of the Fourth Gospel) and other Greek manuscripts, the versions, and patristic quotations.

In due course we may expect further editions which will take account of the increase in our knowledge of how to construct a text superior to that reproduced here. Meanwhile scholars and students will extend a warm welcome to this edition, which is a credit to the Bible Society and a distinguished contribution to New Testament studies.

A. J. B. HIGGINS

GREEK GRAMMAR

NEW TESTAMENT GREEK : AN INTRODUCTORY GRAMMAR. By ERIC G. JAY.
S.P.C.K. 21s.

THERE are, we are told, welcome signs of a revival of the study of "classical" Greek in schools. Alongside this there is undoubtedly a considerable increase in Biblical studies in the universities. It is to be hoped that these developments will lead more students to read the New Testament in the original Greek. Dr Jay's book is intended for those with no previous knowledge of Greek, but it is admirably suited also as a manual of reference to those who are well acquainted with the language. It is much fuller than existing books of this kind, and has the advantage of including a fair amount of material not usually contained in the more elementary grammars. On the other hand little knowledge, even of grammatical technical terms, is taken for granted, and full explanations are provided of even the simplest constructions. On the whole the arrangement is admirable, and the detailed list of contents enables the student to see exactly where he stands as he works through the grammar. Dr Jay rightly emphasizes the importance of facility in translating English into Greek, and in nearly all the sections provides two exercises for the translation of English into Greek as against one for the translation of Greek into English. Anyone who teaches Greek knows the difficulty many students have of understanding what is required of them when they have to parse. How many of us find our own admonition echoed when, in his useful section on parsing, Dr Jay declares: "When he [the student] comes to the translation of passages

from the New Testament he should never leave a word until he is sure that he can parse it" (p. 50)! There is a useful section on semitisms (pp. 265-70). Special attention should be drawn to the appendix on accents, and to those containing the declensions of nouns, adjectives, and pronouns, and the paradigms of verbs.

It is, perhaps, unfortunate that Dr Jay adopts the term "conjunctive" to denote a mood of which the subjunctive and optative are the primary and historic tenses (pp. 198f.). The more usual treatment of the subjunctive and optative as separate moods is simpler and less confusing. In Appendix 5 we have a list of verbs additional to others given in the body of the book, and the student is referred to these for any verb which does not appear in this list. No doubt it is better for him, even if it takes more time, to familiarize himself with, for instance, the meaning of "verbs with stems ending in a guttural". Nevertheless, even at the risk of repetition, a full alphabetical list of verbs with their principal parts, like that in Moulton-Meecham, might have been preferable.

But these are minor criticisms. Dr Jay is to be congratulated on the production of a grammar book which will be welcomed with enthusiasm by teachers in schools, colleges, and universities. A long and useful life is predicted for it.

A. J. B. HIGGINS

WULFSTAN

THE HOMILIES OF WULFSTAN. By DOROTHY BETHURUN. Clarendon Press. 55s.

MASCULINE erudition, microscopic analysis, and a broad historical synthesis characterize Miss Bethurun's detailed study of the Homilies of Archbishop Wulfstan, all set out in impeccable English, the result of long and patient research in patristic, Anglo-Saxon, and Carolingian sources, and upon the work of her predecessors, especially that of Dr Jost and Miss Whitelock.

Wulfstan, Archbishop of York (1003-23), is to be distinguished from another Wulfstan, also Archbishop of York (c. 931-56) and from Wulfstan, the well-known Bishop of Worcester (1062-95). Over thirty pages are devoted by Miss Bethurun to his life. According to the *Liber Eliensis* he came of an honourable family, probably located in the fenlands, and the charters show that he had at least one brother, possibly two, and two sisters. There is no record of Wulfstan until he became Bishop of London in 996. Florence states that he was an Abbot when translated to Worcester and York, a statement which Miss Bethurun rejects, on the ground that until the translation to York he signs charters as Bishop of London. But would that exclude his tenure of an abbey while Bishop, especially since the monasteries were being taken in hand for reform at that time? He would surely sign as Bishop of London, and our author admits that "he may have had a short period as abbot". He

was certainly a Benedictine, and his work as Archbishop included the promotion of the contemporary Benedictine reform. We have no details of his life as Bishop of London beyond the signing of charters and his reaction to the sailing of the Danes up the Thames as far as the Medway, casting a shadow over his mind which remained with him to the end, deepened by later Danish invasions. While still Bishop of London he used the name *Lupus* in his penitential letters, a fact which caused earlier scholars to assume the existence of another Bishop named *Lupus*.

When he became Archbishop of York he retained the see of Worcester, like his predecessor Ealdulf—possibly since York had been impoverished by the Danes—a practice continued by his successors, which contributed to the Canterbury-York dispute of later times. In the ample library at Worcester he found materials for the writings which Miss Bethurun and her predecessors have succeeded in associating with his name. He was not interested in the Latin poets but in Augustine and Gregory, in the Carolingian writers of an earlier generation and especially in the law codes. Some of the books used by him may have been found at York. "It was under the influence of this literature that Wulfstan began a remarkable career as statesman, reformer, canonist, legislator, and homilist . . . during the early years of his service as metropolitan he wrote all the homilies on essential Christian teaching for both clergy and laity, the Canons of Edgar for the secular clergy, the Laws of Edward and Guthrum to regularise the obligations due (by) the church in the Danelaw, and all the later edicts of Ethelred's reign." This will be news to many students of Saxon Church History, but they must read two chapters in Miss Bethurun's Introduction for further details and also the studies of Miss Whitelock upon which our author bases this section of her own work. Wulfstan became adviser to the young King Cnut and "put into form Cnut's important codes of law".

However, it is chiefly as a Homilist that Miss Bethurun is concerned with Wulfstan, and here her work is no less precise. It is fully set forth in the Introduction, which includes a study of the manuscripts, the contents, the language, style, order of the Homilies and the Worcester glosses. The main body of the book contains the text of the Homilies with *apparatus criticus* and very full notes which appear in the next section, followed by three appendixes.

Hitherto, preaching in the Saxon Church has been associated in students' text-books with the name of Ælfric, Abbot of Cerne, whose sermon on the Eucharist followed the tradition of the Carolingian Ratramn and in turn, over the centuries, influenced the teaching of Ridley. Miss Bethurun has shown conclusively that similar attention was paid to preaching by Archbishop Wulfstan of York, not only in his own homilies but in the models sent out by him to the clergy. Whether or not his influence on Saxon preaching was greater than that of Ælfric may be doubtful and probably may remain so. What is certain, as Dr Jost had already shown, is that the Archbishop took the Abbot of Cerne's pastoral letters as a model and worked upon drafts which he had asked the Abbot to supply. Whether Miss Bethurun has entirely

disentangled the homilies from one another is a little doubtful—perhaps that is now impossible.

The subject matter of the Homilies is concerned with anti-Christ and the end of the world which the savage Danish invasions seemed to portend. Two versions of his famous *Sermo ad Anglos* are printed. There are addresses on the Catholic faith, on Christianity, on Baptism and the Sevenfold Spirit, on the Eucharist, on passages in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, Isaiah and Jeremiah, and on the dedication of a church. But it should be noted that the bulk of the Homilies are in Anglo-Saxon. Of the thirty address printed here, only six are in Latin, four of these being translations of the Saxon version which is also printed. Three have Latin introductions. Notwithstanding this handicap to those who do not read Anglo-Saxon, this book contains a mine of information in the introductory chapters and in the notes, valuable to all students of Church History. Although later studies may revise its conclusions on Wulfstan's work as a legist, it will probably remain definitive for many years, perhaps for good, on the pastoral work of Wulfstan. It is a remarkable achievement.

A. J. MACDONALD

CHRISTUS REX

HE ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN. Bampton Lectures 1958. By J. G. DAVIES. Lutterworth. 35s.

IT IS not often that one appointed to lecture under the will of Canon Bampton succeeds in comprehending all the topics of discussion suggested by that will. But such is the achievement of Dr Davies. His diverse contributions to theology and history, in articles and in books, have ever been characterized by learning and lucidity. Both qualities are richly in evidence here. The fare offered is rich—an examination of the Lord's Ascension in the New Testament, through the early Fathers and the conciliar period to the later sermons (many of which have hitherto remained unexamined).

"On the one hand there was the dominating influence of the Lucan account, and on the other the belief in the resurrection of the flesh . . . A crass carnality, as distinct from the materialism of incarnational Christianity, was fast becoming the basis of Christian hope in the after-life, despite the legitimate protests of an Origen. Such an understanding of the nature of the resurrection body inevitably affected the formulation of the doctrine of the Ascension, and hence the many references to the 'body', to the 'flesh' or to the 'covering' which Christ took with him to heaven. We who cannot accept such an interpretation must perforce reinterpret the teaching of the Fathers . . . and see in the Ascension, not the transportation of an earthly frame to a localized heaven but the consummation of the process, including death and Resurrection, whereby the manhood, i.e. the human organism, of the Son of God was transformed while still retaining its identity." So Dr Davies, on page 146. This

sums up admirably his own thesis, and the manner in which he sets about the task of tracing the Ascension-belief through the first eight centuries.

How then does the author of Acts emerge from the discussion? There has been need for some time for a radical reassessment of Luke as historian, and here we have an impressive and important essay at the task. Tobit, First Kings, parallels with the Third Gospel—all have played their part in a chapter of Acts which has bid fair down the ages to blind us to the eschatological setting in which the Ascension ought to be seen. If some rejoice that typology is seen to have as its hierarch no one less than the author of Luke-Acts, a more sober judgement might be entered as to the grasp of the theological implications and insights which Luke was anxious to convey to his readers.

In a brief review it is impossible to do justice to these Bampton. Certainly they ought to be compulsory reading in all theological colleges, and not simply obtained for the library. The problem of communication remains urgent as ever, and it is to be hoped that this book will have decisive effect on homiletics.

C. S. MANN, O.S.B.

MODERN APOLOGETIC

THE KIRKBRIDE CONVERSATIONS. By HARRY BLAMIRE. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d
THIS is one of the S.P.C.K. Seraph books, and if the others are up to its level the publishers deserve our gratitude for giving such good quality at so little cost. The Conversations are between Canon Kirkbride, an experienced parish priest, and Roland Tay, a young schoolmaster agnostic. Other minor characters help to fill in the background, the most vivid being an American visitor who provides an opportunity to explain what the Anglican Communion means and, incidentally, to say some things that need saying about the Roman Catholic position. But the conversations are essentially dialogues, of Faith, the Religious Life, the Church, Hope, Death, Conversion.

Perhaps the chief value of this book is that it helps the teacher to know what questions the intellectual sceptic is asking and why he is asking them. But the book can be given to anyone who is honest and intelligent enough to allow that he must at least consider what Christian doctrine has to say; and the Christian layman who meets the sceptic more often than the clergy will find much to help him to give a reasoned defence of his faith. "Defence" is, perhaps, the wrong word. for the Canon invariably turns defence into attack. He is never faulted, and if this seems too good to be true, the author would probably say that there is no reason why he should be; and that, considering his subject and his ability to handle it, is the right answer.

✠ GEORGE WILLESSEN

FRENCH LITURGIES

LITURGICAL RENEWAL. By J. D. BENOIT. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

A FEW years after the Public Worship Regulation Act had been passed in England to suppress the growth of ritualism, the liturgical revival found its beginning in the Reformed Church in France, led by Pastor Bersier in Paris. Through Bersier's English mother, it may be said that the Anglican liturgy had an influence on the liturgical developments in the French Reformed Church.

Professor Benoit shows the new liturgy of his Church to be a return to the oecumenical tradition, with the Preface, Sanctus, and Benedictus all in their traditional order. The offertory, however, is missing, as the offering to God of "ourselves as a living and holy sacrifice" contained in the eucharistic prayer following the account of the Institution is said to take the place of the offertory in the traditional rites.

It is pointed out that the liturgical movement is not an autonomous one but is, in fact, the sign of the rediscovery of the meaning of the Church. Another determining factor is the dogmatic revival now taking place and a return to the Christocentric doctrinal position.

In outlining the recent developments in the Roman Catholic Church in France, Professor Benoit welcomes the new participation by the people in the Mass and adoption of the basilican position by the celebrant. He speaks, too, of the spectacular transformation taking place through the increased use of the vernacular. Thus, this book provides an interesting example of what is happening all over the continent at the present time—namely, the catholic trends in doctrine and worship so evident in Reformed and Protestant Churches—and at the same time the reforms now progressing within the Roman Church, all largely the result of the Biblical revival.

JOHN R. SATTERTHWAITE

CATHOLICISM ROMAN AND ANGLICAN

THE TEACHINGS OF POPE PIUS XII. Edited by M. CHINIGO. Methuen. 25s.

"BUT I AM A CATHOLIC!" By OSCAR HARDMAN. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d. (5s. 6d. paper.)

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION. By G. F. S. GRAY. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d. (7s. 6d. paper.)

IT WAS a good idea to make an anthology out of the late Pope's numerous encyclicals and addresses. Some subjects however are dealt with at disproportionate length and with some duplication, e.g. marriage; on the other hand, prayer gets only three not very inspired pages. There is not much about our Lady, not even the Apostolic Constitution which made her Assumption an article of faith (nor the

Epilogue to *Mystici Corporis*, which stated, "She too it was who by her most powerful intercession obtained for the new-born Church the prodigious Pentecostal outpouring" of the Holy Spirit).

On matters scientific the most interesting section is taken from an address to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, and deals with the age of the earth, though the Pope exaggerated the importance of any approximate dating of it for religion. (His translator should have remembered that for English readers *billion* means a million million, not a thousand million.) Without committing himself to belief in evolution, he went so far as to declare it an open question (p. 267), but Genesis 2 and 3 are still taken to be historical; pain and death were no part of God's plan for mankind (p. 122). Speaking of conjugal relations, he made the strange statement that "the transgression of this norm is as ancient as original sin itself" (p. 32).

Pius XII was not afraid to magnify his office. "The Pope has the divine promises; even in his human weakness he is invincible and unshakable" (p. 326): he "unworthily indeed, but really, brings among men the person of Jesus Christ, His Word and authority" (p. 354): equally each Pope is Peter *redivivus* (p. 234). It is hardly surprising therefore he required "full assent" to be given to papal utterances, whether *ex cathedra* or not (p. 260); this makes it the more unfortunate that he himself contradicted an important passage in his predecessor's encyclical *Casti Connubii* on the primary reason and cause of marriage. Must full assent only be given to the utterances of the living Pope?

The English of the translation is not without fault. The *Shorter O.E.D.* knows nothing of *envisioned*, and finds *inexistence* rare. *Disarmed* is not the same as *unarmed*, and *intangible* does not mean *that ought not to be touched*. The brief glossary at the end of the book explains what *hedonism* and *electron* mean, but leaves *usufructuary*, *deontology*, and *aprioristic* unexplained. Misprints in the Latin occur (pp. 33, 218, 246).

Dr Hardman has written a useful piece of Anglican apologetic in his book, "*But I am a Catholic!*" In the first part he examines the Roman see in relation to the whole Catholic Church, and shows that far from being "the old Church" Rome is an exceedingly new one, with articles of faith unknown to the apostolic Church. If then Rome is wrong, what is right? And the second half sketches English Church history, and shows that Catholic is a better description of the Church of England than of the Church of Rome. He occasionally exaggerates: the Roman Catholic practice of conditional baptism of converts (p. xvii), claim to have all the answers (p. xxi), salvation assured only to Roman Catholics (p. xxi).

Mr Gray's sketch of the Anglican Communion is partly a historical survey of the expansion of the Church of England, and partly a more general discussion of Anglicanism. The survey reads like material collected with a view to writing a survey rather than the finished article, and the isolated events are not sufficiently woven into a coherent narrative. The sketch of Anglicanism is more lively, and gives a trustworthy picture in general, though it is inaccurate in detail. The Articles

do not reject "the sacrifice of Masses" and do reject Zwinglianism (p. 112); the sanction given to the Revised Prayer Book is not accurately expressed (p. 124). The Prayer Book does mention hymns, and C. Wesley was not the first distinguished Anglican hymn-writer (p. 130). It is highly ingenuous to write, "The laity have an important share in choosing bishops: indeed, in England the clergy's share in this is small" (p. 141). The book ends with some useful Anglican self-criticism; Dr Hardman's book would have been strengthened by greater willingness to admit weaknesses. Misprints occur on pp. 42, 134, 156: Martindale (p. 94) should be Martinson; Fr H. St John is O.P., not S.J. (p. 154); there is something wrong with the footnote on p. 158.

KENNETH N. ROSS

THE METHODIST EUCHARIST

THOUGHTS ON HOLY COMMUNION. By J. ERNEST RATTENBURY. Epworth. 9s. 6d.

THIS thoughtful and devout book by a Wesleyan evangelist disclaims controversy, and is directed towards bringing before the general reader a survey of non-Roman thought on the Holy Communion in the light of the writer's own special aims. These seem to be to show the evangelistic power of Holy Communion, to bring back (especially, perhaps, for some of his own people) the Blessed Sacrament to its true equal eminence with the proclamation of the Word of God; and (for all people) to show that the sacramental and spiritual are not opposites, but that the sacramental is a mode of the spiritual.

The author, while recognizing the special excellence of the eastern rites, limits himself to a sketch of the development of the Liturgy from the Last Supper down to Cranmer. There is an adequate statement of emergent thought on Remembrance, Real Presence, and Sacrifice. Perhaps added weight would have been given to the account of the Lord's Supper after a careful consideration of Jeremias's *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*; and this would in turn have helped later on in the chapter on sacrifice.

The writing is clear and at times luminous, and much of significance is said on the Real Presence and the eschatological aspect. Yet an impression is left of the Eucharist as a pious, beautiful, joyful observance, rather than as an act of power. It is true that the writer points out his belief in the converting strength of the service. Somehow, however, the wider reach of the Liturgy is not here. An act is done in remembrance of Christ, by his command; and God's natural gifts, changed by human work to human use, are then transfigured by man's surrender to God in and through Christ. And there for all to see is the structure of the new society—"Thy Kingdom come on earth, as it is in Heaven". Without some such teaching "my communion" will appear again as "a legend emptied of concern", and that most of all to the unfed multitude

who do not understand that God is asking for their co-operation in his grand design.

The use of Charles Wesley's hymns in illustrating the text is excellently done, and should send many people to read the author's *The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley*. A short bibliography and an index would be helpful in any future edition.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

THE WAY OF LOVE

TEN YEARS: ECHOES FROM THE FIRST DECADE OF "CHILD CARE", 1947-56.

Edited by ALAN A. JACKA. Epworth. 7s. 6d.

TO BUILD AND TO PLANT. By HERBERT W. ABBA. Independent Press. 7s. 6d.

THE first of these books consists of a selection of material taken from the quarterly review entitled *Child Care*, a periodical which seeks to express the views and to relate the experiences of all those who are engaged in the work of caring for children, particularly those who work under the direction of one or other of the voluntary societies which exist for this purpose. It is a survey which not only looks back over a period of ten years, at the start of which the "Children's Act" of 1948 became law and statutory authority became officially responsible for children's welfare, but also looks hopefully to the future, seeking for fresh opportunities for both voluntary and statutory agents to co-operate more fully and with a unity of purpose forged by a mutual recognition of the fundamental needs of children. The article on "Motive", for example, is a critical and constructive approach to the subject of the ideal relationship between social workers and the people whom they serve. On the one hand, the essential love which is the primary factor in the work may so easily be dissipated into mere sentimentalism. On the other hand, professional zeal may substitute that kind of technical efficiency which can be so easily devoid of any real sympathy. We would add that the determining factor in establishing the best motive is not merely love of man, but love of God.

The second book is concerned with an entirely different subject. It is the reminiscence by a retired Congregational Minister of an exceptionally long pastorate in one place. In a district of Beverley, Yorkshire, the author worked for forty-five years building, in turn, a large congregation and then a new place of worship for his people. It is a token of his love for God and for his people which he offers to share with a reading public.

FRANK A. F. POULDEN

INDEPENDENCY I

THE INDEPENDENTS AND THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR. By GEORGE YULE.
Cambridge University Press. 21s.

MR YULE has provided a detailed examination of the evidence from which to give an answer, if such can be found, to one of the most tantalizing problems of seventeenth-century history: what is the connection between the Parliamentary Independent Party and religious Independency? Were the political aims of the Independents clearly defined and coherent? Did they derive more or less directly from theological convictions? To what extent were theologically-derived political aims coloured by economic, political, and even self-seeking considerations? In any case, whence did the Independents derive their supporters?

Upon a detailed consideration of such specialized and complicated issues Mr Yule enters; and it becomes clear at once that he has mastered the material and has come to certain interesting conclusions. The impression he creates is the more convincing because of his engaging candour in admitting the provisional nature of some of his judgements and in recognizing the probability that "there remains vital evidence" still to be found. With fine independence he examines and criticizes Professor Trevor-Roper's hypothesis about the relation of the Independents to the gentry and J. H. Hexter's theory about the Presbyterian Independents.

About half the book is devoted to learned appendixes which make available information otherwise hidden from the general view in learned journals or unpublished documents: there is a list of the political Independents, of radical members of Parliament at the time of Pride's Purge, and of Congregational Ministers, 1640-60. There is an excellent bibliography.

JOHN HUXTABLE

INDEPENDENCY II

THE ANSWER. By JOHN NORTON, translated by DOUGLAS HORTON.
Harvard University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 38s.

WHEN, in 1644, the Westminster Assembly issued an appeal for understanding to the Reformed Churches on the Continent, William Apollonius, pastor-theologian of the church of Middelburg, Holland, took the call seriously. He and the local elders were alarmed at the emergence of "Independency" in Britain and New England, and accordingly, Apollonius sent to the dissenting brethren in London a set of questions as to their methods of church government.

The group of Independents who received this inquiry unanimously nominated John Norton, Minister of the church in Ipswich, New England, to reply. "Of all the authors I have perused concerning the

opinions of these dissenting brethren, none to me was more informative than Mr. John Norton", says the church historian Thomas Fuller of *The Answer*. But because it was written in Latin, it came to be forgotten within a few years of publication.

Here, for the first time, Norton's *Answer* has been translated into English by the Dean of Harvard, already known for his work on Puritanism. Handsomely produced, the work illustrates how the religious exiles on the other side of the Atlantic attempted to justify their beliefs and those of the minority they had left behind them in England, on matters such as the "Qualifications of Church Members", the "Exercise of Prophecy", and "Separation and Schism".

This is a book for the specialist rather than the general reader.

GORDON HUELIN

A BELOVED PRELATE

SPENCER LEESON: SHEPHERD, TEACHER, FRIEND. S.P.C.K. 15s. 6d.

SPENCER LEESON himself did not wish his biography to be written and did his best to make it impossible by destroying his own records and letters. We can be very grateful to the group of friends who have disregarded his wishes and given us this most attractive memoir of a loveable personality.

Inevitably in a short biography of this type all who knew Spencer Leeson will wish that more space could have been given to one aspect or another of his varied life. In particular, it proved difficult for the authors to give a fuller account of his great services to Christian education. He was not only headmaster of two great schools but for many years he took an active part in the affairs of the National Society. When the Church of England Council for Education was established he was the obvious choice as Chairman of its Schools Council. What he did to preserve the Church's aided schools, to give the fullest Christian content to Controlled Schools, and to strengthen the co-operation between the teachers and the churches is known fully only to those who were privileged to work closely with him. Some day we can hope that story will be written—but it will require a volume in itself.

The authors, and in particular, the one who collected the material and gave it its final form, are to be congratulated on the balance they have kept between the various parts of Spencer Leeson's career. The final chapter—the Episcopate—is particularly valuable because it reveals so well the fulness of his personality and the flowering of his experience.

This memoir is a model of its kind. It will keep alive the memory of one who rendered great service to the Church, and it will be an inspiration to many who follow him.

✠ ROBERT PETRIBURG: